



**MCH Nurse Home Visitation:
Durham Connects and the Family Connects Model**

Elizabeth Stevens, MPH, RN, Ben Goodman, PhD,
Robert Murphy, PhD, Karen O'Donnell, PhD, & Kenneth Dodge, PhD

November 4, 2015

Presenter disclosures

Elizabeth Stevens, MPH, RN

The following personal financial relationships with commercial interests relevant to this presentation existed during the past 12 months:

no relationships to disclose.

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.)

- 2nd 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/>

Contact info

- LEAD INVESTIGATORS: Ken Dodge, Ph.D., Robert Murphy, Ph.D.
- PROGRAM CO-DIRECTORS: Karen O'Donnell, Ph.D. – kod@duke.edu
Ben Goodman, Ph.D. – ben.goodman@duke.edu
- IMPLEMENTATION SPECIALIST: Liz Stevens, MPH, RN –
elizabeth.stevens@duke.edu
- NURSING DIRECTOR: Paula Wright, BSN, RN, IBCLC
- COMMUNITY RESOURCE SPECIALIST: Jeff Quinn, MPH

References

- Alonso-Marsden, S., Dodge, K.A., O'Donnell, K.J., Murphy, R.A., Sato, J.M., & Christopoulos, C. (2013). Family risk as a predictor of initial engagement and follow-through in a universal nurse home visiting program to prevent child maltreatment. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 37, 555-565.
- Collaboration for Impact (2015). The collective impact framework. <http://www.collaborationforimpact.com/collective-impact/>
- Dodge, K.A., Goodman, W.B., Murphy, R.A., O'Donnell, K., Sato, J., & Guptill, S. (2014). Implementation and randomized controlled trial evaluation of universal postnatal nurse home visiting [Special Issue]. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104, S136-S143.
- Dodge, K.A., Goodman, W.B., Murphy, R.A., O'Donnell, K., Sato, J., & Guptill, S. (2013). Randomized controlled trial evaluation of universal postnatal nurse home visiting: Impacts on child emergency medical care at age 12-months [Special Issue]. *Pediatrics*, 132, S140-S146.
- Dodge, K.A., Goodman, W.B., Murphy, R.A., O'Donnell, K., Sato, J. (2013). Toward population impact from home visiting. *Zero to Three*, 33, 17-23.
- Home Visiting (2015). Historical timeline. <http://homevisiting.org/history>
- Kania, J. & Kramer, J. (2011). Collective impact. *Sanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter, 36-41.

References (cont.)

- US Census QuickFacts (2015). Beaufort County, NC.
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/37/37013.html>
- US Census QuickFacts (2015). Bertie County, NC.
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/37/37015.html>
- US Census QuickFacts (2015). Chowan County, NC.
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/37/37041.html>
- US Census QuickFacts (2015). Cook County, MN.
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/27/27031.html>
- US Census QuickFacts (2015). Durham County, NC.
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/37/37063.html>
- US Census QuickFacts (2015). Guilford County, NC.
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/37/37081.html>
- US Census QuickFacts (2015). Hyde County, NC.
<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/37/37095.html>