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Nurse home visiting history

• Bellevue Hospital in NY (1731/1732) – founded SON in 1873
• Expansion of urban settlement houses (1900-1920s)
• Nursing moves toward hospitals and clinics following WWI
• 1935 – Title V Maternal and Child Health program funded as part of Social Security Act
• Resurgence of home visiting as part of War on Poverty (1960s)
• 1977 – First Nurse Family Partnership study launched in Elmira, NY
• 1992 – Healthy Families America model established
• 1995 – Early Head Start established from the Head Start model
• 2010 – Affordable Care Act designates funding specifically for home visiting, establishing Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program (MIECHV)

http://homevisiting.org/history

Successes of targeted home visiting

• Intensive intervention for higher-risk families
• Long-term services show improved maternal and child outcomes
• Examples: Nurse Family Partnership, Parents as Teachers, Healthy families America, Early Head Start

• Considerations:
  • More expensive per family
  • Demographics factors do not always predict risk
The case for universal home visiting

• Every family is vulnerable at the birth of a child
• Universal is the route to community-level change
• Complementary to more intensive targeted programs, as a cost-effective way of triaging and referring families
• Non-stigmatizing entry into the community’s system of care
• Gaps in the system of care can be identified

The Family Connects Model

• Connect with all families after birth
• Home visit scheduled for 2-3 weeks postpartum
• Individualized assessment of family risk and needs
• Education and supportive guidance by home visiting nurse
• Connection to appropriate community resources
• Parents connect more easily with their newborn
Family Connects in Durham County, NC

• Program based out of non-profit Center for Child & Family Health
• 2 main birthing hospitals
  • Target population = all Durham County births
• 8 home visiting nurses + 1 nursing supervisor
• Community characteristics (2014):
  • Urban community with population ~300,000
  • 53% White, 39% Black, 13% Hispanic
  • 19% living below poverty level 2009-2013
• Funding from local endowment, county, Medicaid, small grants

US Census QuickFacts, Durham County, NC

Results from evaluation in Durham

• 1st RCT July 2009-Dec 2010
  • 4,777 families, even day births received intervention (69% penetration rate)
  • Independent impact evaluation using intent-to-treat design
  • At age 6 months:
    • More mother-reported positive parenting behaviors
    • Higher quality blinded observer-rated mother parenting
    • Higher quality mother-rated father-infant relationship
    • Higher quality child care center quality (when in care)
    • Higher quality blinded observer-rated home environments
    • Less mother clinical anxiety
  • At age 12 months:
    • 85% fewer hospital overnights
    • 50% less total infant emergency medical care
    • For every $1 spent, $3.02 saved by community in reduced infant emergency medical care
Results from evaluation in Durham (cont.)

• 2\textsuperscript{nd} RCT Jan 2014-June 2014
  • 937 families, odd day births received intervention (64\% penetration rate)
  • Independent impact evaluation using intent-to-treat design
  • Results forthcoming from family interviews and administrative records

• Economic Evaluation
  • Looking at return on investment of program into childhood
  • Interviewing families and gathering administrative records from first RCT
  • Results forthcoming in 2016

Scaling up: Dissemination & implementation

• Step 1: Readiness Assessment
• Step 2: Program Installation
• Step 3: Initial Implementation
• Step 4: On-site Assessment and Certification
• Step 5: Full Operation
• Step 6: On-site Review
• Continuing Yearly Audits
Family Connects in Eastern NC

• 4 rural counties: Chowan, Bertie, Hyde, and Beaufort
• Several area birthing hospitals, recruit families using vital records and referrals from pediatricians/OBs
  • Target population = all births in above 4 counties
• 4 home visiting nurses + 1 nursing supervisor
• Community characteristics (2014):
  • Rural counties with 1 micropolitan area, total population 87,939
  • 62% White, 35% Black, 6% Hispanic
  • 23% living below poverty level 2009-2013
• Funding from state Race to the Top Early Learning Challenge grant, Medicaid

US Census QuickFacts, Chowan, Bertie, Hyde and Beaufort Counties, NC

Family Connects in Guilford County, NC

• Program based out of local health department
• 2 main birthing hospitals
  • Target population = all Guilford County births
• 15 home visiting nurses + 2 nursing supervisors
• Community characteristics (2014):
  • Rural county with 2 urban areas, population 512,119
  • 58% White, 34% Black, 8% Hispanic
  • 18% living below poverty level 2009-2013
• Funding from Smart Start grant, county, Medicaid

US Census QuickFacts, Guilford County, NC
Family Connects in Quad Cities, IA

- Program based out of health system’s VNA
- Recruiting from 1 birthing hospital
  - Target population = all Scott County births + health system’s births from Clinton, Jackson, and Rock Island Counties
- 3 home visiting nurses + 1 nursing supervisor
- Community characteristics (2014):
  - 1,166 births annually
  - 74% White, 13% Black, 4% Hispanic
- Funding from county foundation, health system philanthropy fund

Family Connects in Minnesota – Early stages

- Program will be based out of local health departments – Cook, McLeod, Sibley, and Meeker Counties
- Several area birthing hospitals, varying by county
- Teams vary by county
- Target community being determined, all counties are rural
- Funding currently being explored
Future directions

- Recent certification by US DHHS as an evidence-based home visiting program (Home Visiting Evidence of Effectiveness)
- Additional implementation sites in negotiation for several communities nationwide
- Establishment of a Family Connects “hub” in Durham, NC
- Continued efforts for sustained funding

Questions to consider

- What is the best “home” for a universal home visiting program (i.e. health system, local health department, visiting nurse association, etc.)?
- How can funding be sustained?
- How can the case be made to appeal to the local business community (improving the health of future employment pool)?
- How can a framework such as collective impact be used to entrench universal home visiting into the expected trajectory of care?

http://www.collaborationforimpact.com/collective-impact/
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