

MCH Training Program Evaluation
TITLE V DIRECTORS AND REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF INTERVIEW
SCHEDULE

Introduction

The National Center for Education in Maternal and Child Health (NCEMCH), a research center of Georgetown University, is being funded by the Maternal and Child Health Bureau (MCHB), Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), to examine the Maternal and Child Health (MCH) Training Program. The MCH Training Program Evaluation is part of the federal MCHB'S larger effort to document the impact of its investments in Title V Block Grant programs and its discretionary grant programs or Special Projects of Regional and National Significance (SPRANS). The analysis of the MCH Training Program is divided into two phases. The goal of phase I, the product of which is a report titled *Building the Future: The Maternal and Child Health Training Program*, is to describe the 14 training priority areas, trace the evolution of the priorities over time, and to identify common themes across the training projects. Phase II will include an analysis of the distinguishing characteristics of each of the 13 long-term MCH training programs; explore the accomplishments of the training program; assess the satisfaction of “customers” of the training program, from trainees to faculty to MCH program planners and administrators; and to determine unmet needs. This focus group is designed to help us better understand and assess the MCH Training Program's impact on the recipients—in particular, Title V directors—of its services.

V1. How familiar are you with the training grants in your state? In your region?

V2. Have you received any consultation or technical assistance from any of the training grants? If not, why do you think you didn't?

If yes, describe.

A10. What were the strengths and weaknesses of the technical assistance or consultation you received?

A10.1. Have you ever been unsuccessful in obtaining technical assistance or consultation from a training grantee in your state or region? If yes, why?

- V3. Are you aware of any MCH-supported programs in your state that have received technical assistance or consultation and/or continuing education from an MCH training project? Please describe and elaborate. (Type of organizations? Frequency? Outcome?)
- V4. Do you see any particular benefits of having a training project in your state or region? If yes, what are the benefits?
- V5. How would you characterize the impact of the geographic distribution of the various training grants in terms of accessibility to consultation and technical assistance?
- O3. Do you believe that the training project(s) in your state has helped to improve the system of health care for children in any way? {Probe: This might include new service delivery models, standards of care, legislation, etc.} Please explain.
- O4. Do you believe that other groups, such as professional associations, have been affected by the MCH Training Program? Please explain.
- O5. Are there any significant changes that have occurred in the field over the last 20 years that you believe are at least partially attributable to the MCH Training Program? Please elaborate.
- P2. Do you believe that all of the goals of the MCH Training Program (leadership training, consultation, continuing education) can be effectively met by every training grant? If not, why not? Are there any priority-specific barriers?

- P3. Are there other (e.g., better, cheaper) ways to address some of the goals of the MCH Training Program? Are there other models that might work better, such as funding only one center at a higher level, or funding multiple schools at lower levels?
- V6. To what extent do you believe that the MCH Training Program is integrated with other SPRANS initiatives? With the MCH Block Grant? With other HRSA initiatives?
- P6. What process would you recommend for MCHB to continuously assess and evaluate its portfolio? How could we know when specific training priorities have met their missions?