

**Family Planning Medicaid Waiver Evaluators Conference Call
MINUTES**

June 9, 2008, 1:00-2:00 pm EDT

Participants

Evaluators: Molly Carpenter (VA), Andrea Johnson (NC), Dave Murday (SC), and Jeff Roth (FL)
State Staff: Susan Barber (TN), Tysha David (NC), Karen Jackson (FL), Lois Lockett (LA), Margaret Major (TN), Bernie Operario (NC), and Marcia Swartz (NC)
Sheps Center: Julie DeClerque, Priscilla Guild and Ellen Shanahan
Others: Adam Sonfield (Guttmacher)

The June 9 conference call began with a discussion of the latest set of state data sent around by Priscilla Guild prior to the call. Discussion focused on the major changes to the data, including:

- Florida's data has been updated to create a better estimate of the eligible population for their waiver (which, for most of 2006, was enrolling only women who were leaving Medicaid postpartum). Jeff Roth reported that the revised number may still be slightly overestimated, but not so much as to account for the comparatively low results for indicator 1, the percent of eligible population enrolled (2.6% in Florida, vs. more than 75% in Alabama and South Carolina). These numbers may indicate an issue with enrollment procedures and outreach. Because the state has changed its eligibility standards and is now automatically enrolling eligible women, these numbers may change substantially in 2007.
- Pris has continued to collect data to explore the relationship between the Medicaid waiver programs and states' Title X programs (see last month's minutes). Alabama has now used data from their Medicaid data systems to identify which providers are supported by Title X, a methodology that appears to be an improvement over relying on data from the Family Planning Annual Report (the Title X data system).

Jeff noted that Florida's data indicates that very few waiver participants are being served by private (non Title X) providers in the state, just 14%. All of the other states with reported data had much higher rates of participation by private providers.

- Pris emphasized that in comparing across states, we will need to be very clear about how long each program has been around, because the newer programs (e.g., NC) seem to start off with much lower rates of participation. We will also need to be clear about differences in each program's eligibility standards (e.g., postpartum vs. income-based).
- We also discussed whether it would be possible yet to look at 2007 data. We were not sure whether 2007 would be available yet through the Current Population Survey, to allow for estimates of the eligible population, but the consensus was that looking at indicators C and D (the numbers of women enrolled and served in the program) would be useful regardless.
- *Homework:* Send indicators C and D for 2007 to Pris.

The discussion then turned to other indicators to compare across states. The consensus was to put aside indicators E, F, 2b and 2c, related to use of contraceptives and effective contraceptives, because of their complexity (e.g., identifying all the applicable procedure codes; agreeing on rules for addressing the use of long-term methods).

Instead, we focused on the set of indicators related to expected births and births averted. Indicator A, the baseline fertility rate, was acknowledged to be calculated differently across states. Some states find an overall fertility rate for the entire population, weighting the rates for age-groups according to their prevalence in the population of waiver participants. Others calculate rates only for specific age-groups and only get to overall numbers at the end of the process, by adding up births averted to each age-group. Also, states have already made these various estimates based on their state's specific eligibility criteria, and trying to standardize them for women ages 19-44 did not seem feasible. The consensus was to ignore indicator A and go directly to indicators 4a and 4b (expected births and

estimated births averted). For cross-state comparison, Pris will calculate a ratio of 4b to D—the number of births averted per program participant.

- *Homework:* Send indicators 4a and 4b for 2006 to Pris, along with details on the age-groups included in those calculations.

Finally, we briefly discussed scheduling for the rest of the year. We decided to stay with monthly calls for the time being, so as not to lose momentum. At some point soon, after we find ourselves comfortable with the methodology and comparability of the various indicators, we should start discussing how we could write up the findings as benchmarks for the field.

Next Call: July 14th from 1 until 2 PM EDT. The call-in number for all the calls is (919) 962-2740.