

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

June 8, 2009, 1:00-2:00 pm EDT

Participants

Evaluators: Janet Bronstein (AL); Jeff Roth (FL); Kathy Vetter (IL); Dave Murday (SC); Aradhana Sathiadevan, Kendra Sippel-Theodore (TX), and Molly Carpenter (VA)

State Staff: Kris-Tena Albers, Cathy Canfield, Karen Jackson, Catherine McGrath, Susan McNamara, Margaret Rankin, Lynn Smith, Dan Thompson (FL); Julie Doestch, Linda Wheal (IL); Sondra Burns (LA); Tysha Grays, Bernie Operario, Marcia Swartz (NC); Gerald Craver (VA); Susan Barber and Margaret Major (TN)

Others: Julie Sharp (CMS); Adam Sonfield (Guttmacher); Priscilla Guild (Sheps Research Fellow); Julie DeClerque and Ellen Shanahan (Sheps Center)

Old Business: The May call was cancelled, so minutes for June include some updates that were due in May. Note that during the April meeting, the group had suggested to Julie and Tom from CMS that they provide templates (e.g., for budget neutrality) to be added to the FP Waiver Evaluator's website. These are still pending, and we will ask again during our July call.

Beginning in May, minutes from all prior meetings are available on the website and are linked to the list of topics discussed in each monthly meeting for easy access.

New Business: Dave opened the June call welcoming everyone and reminding everyone that the topics for the call were hearing back from the two workgroups, one on Benchmark Measures and the second on Provider Mix. Dave referred to several documents on the website <http://www.shepscenter.unc.edu/data/Rndmu/FPMedicaidWaiver/> namely (1) Definitions of Common Indicators, (2) First Indicator Summary, and (3) Provider Mix by State (the latter two are in the private workgroup partition of the website, and to access them you will need the username and passcode).

Benchmarking Workgroup: Dave Murday (SC), Jeff Roth (FL) and Kim Dauner (SC)

Previously, the group decided we needed an overall framework to consolidate our comparative information to help us review what we have done so far and what we still need to tackle. Dave reviewed the original indicators, their definition, and confirmed with the group if these were still relevant, comprehensive, and feasible in terms of having enough states that thin they can get these data and share them. The indicators and related comments, briefly, were as follows:

- 1) Number of women eligible for waiver: adjusted CPS data
 - a. Would all states be willing to use that definition for purposes of cross-state comparison (see document #1 referred to above for specific definitions)
 - b. In FL, this does not map to waiver project, as FL waiver is not just 185% FPL

- c. Adam commented that this is very useful for movement toward state-option rather than a waiver; there was a question about the future of the waivers “demonstration” status. Currently, Congress leaves it up to each State to decide how it wants to determine whether it is still a demonstration or not.
- 2) Unduplicated number of enrollees
 - a. This one is important especially as States are required to demonstrate an annual quota of enrollees.
- 3) Number of participants
- 4) Total Title X clients and total waiver clients seen in Title X
 - a. This relates back to the issue of provider mix;
 - b. Concern raised whether all states will be able to separate Medicaid and FP Waiver clients in Title X
 - c. Even if we satisfy the Federal evaluation requirements, we may want to go beyond in order to justify/assure that waivers are serving above and beyond the usual HD/previously covered populations.
- 5) Expected number of births and birth averted
 - a. These should both be pretty standard since required by CMS
- 6) Birth cost savings
 - a. Again, pretty standard but may vary by state. We would come up with a standard method in order to compare (1st year infant costs? Mother’s prenatal and delivery costs? Count *all* Medicaid expenditures for Mom, or limit to pregnancy-related ?)
- 7) Birth-to-conception interval (only some states have as an outcome)
 - a. Some discussion about how to standardize — birth to birth, birth to conception? Dave cited a review article with argument for birth to conception. IL uses B to B in their design. AL cannot get it, no BC data to enable this calculation.
 - b. Has anyone who includes this indicator (however they measure it) seen any change over time? Yes, AK and SC both have, with SC seeing difference in 1st 8 years and then slowing after that. FL linked BC to Medicaid files and waiver population had 3-month longer birth interval (ie, improved) than non-waiver population.
 - c. States that could report this indicator: FL, IL, NC, TX, and SC (among those present on call).

Provider Mix Kathy Vetter (IL) Kim Dauner (SC) Kendra Sippel-Theodore (TX)

1) Provider mix serving Waiver participants does not tell us much unless we know what the overall state profile of provider use is (e.g., Title X, V and XX).

2) How do you classify FQHCs? Are they public/private? Kathy offered to put together an outline of issues/talking points and circulate to the group to get everyone's input with the goal of producing a common framework for classifying provider types. Kathy’s workgroup can provide suggested categories to the group, who can then reply whether they can or cannot respond with data. If states have schema or ideas, please send to Kathy Vetter.

3) How do Physician fees affect provider mix? This issue was tabled for awhile until we make headway on the broader issue of provider mix.

Publications: When the question was asked about what we could / should do with all the information we were collecting, Janet Bronstein offered to lead a group of volunteers and have a call be devoted to such a discussion (plan was for the July call). Should we write up some of what we do for professional journals? Janet suggested we talk with Adam about how we might collaborate with the Guttmacher Institute on this. Kathy Vetter and Ruth Eudy (AR) volunteered to work with Janet on this as well.

On-Going Each state should continue to email the following to the Sheps Center. Please send to Ellen_Shanahan@unc.edu. These will be posted on the group's Website:

1. Final Waiver Evaluation Plan for your state
2. Annual Summary Report for your program
3. Papers, presentations, or ancillary reports related to FP waiver activities or evaluation
4. Survey tools, questionnaires that may be useful to fellow FP waiver evaluators
5. Name and contact information for your state's evaluator (program and data person)

Make sure any documents being sent have State clearance for distribution to the group. User name and passcode for the private section of the site is available through each state's contact. See website for list of names and contact information.

Next Call: Monday, July 13th from 1 until 2 PM EDT. The call-in number for all the calls is (919) 962-2740.