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Presentation Outline

- The purpose/background of the EBHV grant program
- The survey of grantees and their systems change partners
- A few initial results from the baseline survey
  - Characteristics of the partnerships
  - Variability in collaboration quality and the structure of partnership networks
- Next analytic steps and future directions
The Purpose of the EBHV Grant Program

- In 2008, CB funded 17 grantees in 15 states to:
  - Select home visiting program models that were evidence-based (as defined for purposes of the grant)
  - Build infrastructure to implement, scale up, and sustain them with fidelity to their evidence-based models
  - Participate in a cross-site evaluation

- The grantees engaged partner organizations to build infrastructure and implement home visiting

- As part of the cross-site study, we are examining the partnerships and how they change over time

Source: Del Grosso & Daro (2009).
## Home Visiting Models Selected by Grantees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
<th>Number of Grantees that selected 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.
Today’s Focus: The Partnerships at Baseline

- Grantees nominated up to 25 partners to be surveyed

- Baseline survey (Spring 2010)
  - Characteristics of partner organizations
  - Quality of the collaborations
  - The “network” structure of the partnerships
1. Members of the Partner Network and Their Main Activities
## Grantees Engaged 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>National model developer or support organization for home visiting model</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (school district, advocacy group, etc.)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 EBHV Partner Survey, Mathematica Policy Research
# Main Roles Are in Planning, Delivery and T/TA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main Roles in EBHV Grant Program</th>
<th>Grantees (n=15)</th>
<th>Partners (n=227)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program planning and policy development</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct health care or social service delivery</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical assistance and training</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and Evaluation</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding for health care or social services</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and certification</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of health care or social services</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2010 EBHV Partner Survey, Mathematica Policy Research
2. Quality of the Collaborations
We Measured Five Dimensions of Positive Collaborations

- **Purpose/Priority**
  - “Our collaborative effort was started because we wanted to do something about an important problem.”

- **Rules/Norms/Roles**
  - “Our membership was not dominated by any one group or sector.”

- **Trust/Effort**
  - “Members were more interested in getting a good group decision than improving the position of their home organization.”

- **Openness/Shared Goal**
  - “Divergent opinions were expressed and listened to.”

- **Achieve Goal**
  - “Our group was effective in obtaining the resources it needed to accomplish its objectives.”

Source: “Working Together Survey” as used in 2010 EBHV Partner Survey, Mathematica Policy Research
Quality of Collaboration Was High Overall, Though Varied by Domain and Grantee

Source: 2010 EBHV Partner Survey, Mathematica Policy Research
Agreement Was Not as Strong on Openness and Shared Goals

Source: 2010 EBHV Partner Survey, Mathematica Policy Research
3. The Network Structure of the Partnerships
What is Network Data and How Do We Obtain It?

Organizations involved with [GRANTEE A] work together on different kinds of activities. For each organization listed, please indicate which if you worked with the listed organization **in the past 12 months**?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizations / Organizational Units</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[ORG1]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ORG2]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ORG3]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Are Network Data Presented?

- Sociograms give a visual picture of relationships

- Network structure can be quantified
  - E.g. “density” is a measure of the number of connections/ties among members of a network (“0” means no ties, “1” means all possible ties)

- We examine the partner relationships in eight types of infrastructure-building activities:
  - (1) strategic planning; (2) operations; (3) fiscal strategies; (4) communications; (5) collaboration; (6) community and political support; (7) workforce; (8) evaluation capacity
Grantee B Has an Extensive Network for Strategic Planning

Source: 2010 EBHV Partner Survey, Mathematica Policy Research
Grantee B Had More Strategic Planning Collaboration Activity than Other Grantees

Source: 2010 EBHV Partner Survey, Mathematica Policy Research
Grantee B had Less Collaboration on T/TA (Even the Grantee was not as Connected)

Source: 2010 EBHV Partner Survey, Mathematica Policy Research
There are no “right and wrong” network structures

In at least some cases, “disconnected” networks and low densities are understandable and not dysfunctional
- For instance, if partners have specialized tasks or roles that require limited contact

Grantees will consider whether the observed structure of their network aligns with their vision and goals
Baseline Density of All Activities

Source: 2010 EBHV Partner Survey, Mathematica Policy Research
Next Steps

- Combine survey data with other sources to triangulate findings on partnerships
  - Interview data from site visits and telephone interviews
  - Other indicators on partner survey

- Provide grantees with formative feedback
  - Descriptive reports showing their results
  - Help interpreting results
Over Time, with Additional Rounds of Data

- Examine changes in
  - Characteristics of partners
  - Levels of collaboration within grantees
  - Density and structure of infrastructure collaboration networks

- Identify system factors that facilitate
  - Implementation of EBHV programs with fidelity
  - Scale-up of EBHV programs
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