

Measures for Outreach in FP waivers:

1. Do we have everyone enrolled in Medicaid who is eligible?

Count enrollment by demographic and geographic categories, compare to a denominator of who is eligible. We talked about this at the last meeting, because I was puzzling over whether to use the AGI definition of who is eligible, which considers who is sexually active, or the census definition of who fits the demographic category. Repeating the table I sent last time:

| | AGI estimate of eligible population < 100 ages 20-44 | AGI estimate of eligible population 100-133 ages 20-44 | total eligible | enrolled 9-06 15%-133% ages 18-44 | % enrolled by this method | 2000 census 15%-133% 18-44 | % enrolled by this method |
|--------|--|--|----------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| PHA 1 | 3740 | 1630 | 5370 | 5921 | 1.102607 | 13517 | 0.438041 |
| PHA 2 | 8840 | 3910 | 12750 | 10361 | 0.812627 | 25,393 | 0.408026 |
| PHA 3 | 5710 | 1670 | 7380 | 5677 | 0.769241 | 14,004 | 0.405384 |
| pha 4 | 9760 | 3660 | 13420 | 11269 | 0.839717 | 28,145 | 0.400391 |
| PHA 5 | 5610 | 2780 | 8390 | 6247 | 0.744577 | 14,894 | 0.419431 |
| pha 6 | 5040 | 2040 | 7080 | 6896 | 0.974011 | 15,675 | 0.439936 |
| pha7 | 3850 | 930 | 4780 | 4505 | 0.942469 | 12,382 | 0.363835 |
| PHA 8 | 12800 | 3740 | 16540 | 11828 | 0.715115 | 31,009 | 0.381438 |
| PHA 9 | 4220 | 1880 | 6100 | 5871 | 0.962459 | 13,731 | 0.427573 |
| PHA 10 | 4740 | 1740 | 6480 | 5907 | 0.911574 | 14,646 | 0.403318 |
| pha11 | 8030 | 2820 | 10850 | 8549 | 0.787926 | 21,664 | 0.394618 |

Can also look at this by demographics, though it is hard to get accurate denominator data. Enrollment rates are going to depend on enrollment practices – how much automatic enrollment is done across other Medicaid programs such as maternity coverage or children’s coverage.

2. Are people enrolled in the waiver aware that they are enrolled, and if so, how did they hear about the program?

In Alabama we use an enrollee phone survey to gather these data. One thing it shows is that all of the money we have put towards TV ads is probably not worth it. The survey does show that there is more outreach to be done with people who are already enrolled in Medicaid.

Table 4.1 Level of Awareness of Plan First

| | | Demo Year 1 | Demo Year 2 | Demo Year 3 – 4 | Demo Yr 5 |
|---|---|-------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------|
| | | % | % | % | |
| Before this call, had you heard of Plan First? | Yes | 76.8 | 82.5 | 81.0 | 85.3 |
| If so, how did you hear? | Letter from Medicaid | 43.9 | 29.5 | 22.4 | 24.8 |
| | Postcard | 29.5 | 10.4 | 7.4 | 10.4 |
| | Referral from Health Department Provider | na | 38.9 | 39.8 | 42.4 |
| | Referral from Service Provider | 8.4 | 4.8 | 6.3 | 4.8 |
| | Family or friend | 4.6 | 4.7 | 9.9 | 6.9 |
| | Poster | 1.3 | 2.3 | 2.2 | 1.6 |
| | Pamphlet | 6.3 | 3.4 | 4.2 | 3.6 |
| | Radio | | | | 0.2 |
| | Television | | | | 2.7 |
| | Other | 4.5 | 5.5 | 2.7 | 2.6 |
| Did you know you were enrolled in Plan First? | Yes, of all those surveyed | 56.2 | 64.2 | 64.9 | 63.6 |
| | Yes, of those who had heard of Plan First | 73.1 | 77.9 | 80.2 | 74.9 |
| Have you used any family planning services since enrolling in Plan First? | Yes, of all those surveyed | 48.2 | 66.7 | 45.5 | 63.6 |
| | Yes, of those who knew they were enrolled | 59.6 | 75.3 | 56.3 | 75.6 |
| | Yes, of those who had heard of Plan First but did not know they were enrolled | 40.6 | 54.1 | 26.6 | 51.9 |
| | Yes, of those who had not heard of Plan First | 27.2 | 48.2 | 24.4 | 24.4 |

3. Of those enrolled, which groups actually use family planning services? Are there demographic groups that we do not reach?

This of course you can do with claims data – just comparing users to enrollees. Here I find that older women are less likely to be users, White women tend to have less use, and urban areas have less use. I talked to someone at the health department here in Birmingham (PHA 4) about that this year, and she said they do not really have room in the clinics for FP clients, so they do not do too much outreach.

Table 1.4 Service Use by Age and Race Group

| Demo Year | Service Users | | | | % Service Users of Enrollees | | | |
|-----------|---------------|--------|--------|--------|------------------------------|------|------|------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| Total | 44,925 | 56,754 | 61,785 | 64,987 | 48.2 | 49.7 | 46.6 | 43.7 |
| Group | | | | | | | | |
| Age | | | | | | | | |
| < 20 | 7,442 | 8,848 | 8,792 | 8,897 | 66.4 | 69.2 | 64.0 | 47.7 |
| Black | 3,560 | 4,407 | 4,138 | 4,302 | 70.5 | 71.8 | 62.9 | 48.1 |
| White | 3,327 | 4,229 | 4,463 | 4,391 | 64.7 | 67.5 | 65.0 | 47.6 |
| Other | 555 | 212 | 191 | 204 | 54.3 | 55.6 | 63.7 | 44.2 |
| Age | | | | | | | | |
| 20-29 | 28580 | 37383 | 41779 | 44343 | 53.6 | 53.0 | 49.1 | 41.0 |
| Black | 14608 | 20044 | 22452 | 24050 | 58.8 | 58.4 | 53.2 | 46.3 |
| White | 11845 | 16007 | 18463 | 19354 | 52.1 | 49.7 | 44.9 | 36.4 |
| Other | 2127 | 1332 | 864 | 939 | 37.5 | 33.3 | 46.5 | 31.1 |
| Age | | | | | | | | |
| 30-39 | 7775 | 9189 | 9676 | 10035 | 32.9 | 35.8 | 34.3 | 29.3 |
| Black | 4142 | 5023 | 5323 | 5719 | 35.7 | 38.4 | 35.7 | 32.2 |
| White | 3157 | 3798 | 4116 | 4050 | 33.4 | 35.3 | 32.6 | 26.3 |
| Other | 476 | 368 | 237 | 266 | 18.2 | 20.2 | 32.5 | 23.6 |
| Age | | | | | | | | |
| 40 + | 1128 | 1334 | 1538 | 1712 | 22.2 | 26.3 | 27.7 | 24.6 |
| | 652 | 761 | 927 | 956 | 26.0 | 28.0 | 28.7 | 24.9 |

| | Service Users | | | | % Service Users of Enrollees | | | |
|-------|---------------|-----|-----|-----|------------------------------|------|------|------|
| Black | | | | | | | | |
| White | 394 | 515 | 577 | 718 | 21.8 | 27.9 | 26.1 | 24.5 |
| Other | 82 | 58 | 34 | 38 | 10.6 | 11.5 | 32.1 | 20.0 |

Table 2.4 Service Use by Public Health Area

| Public Health Area | % Service Users of Enrollees | | | | |
|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| | Demo Year 1 | Demo Year 2 | Demo Year 3 | Demo Year 4 | Demo Year 5 |
| Total | 47.4 | 48.5 | 46.6 | 39.3 | 43.0 |
| 1 | 55.2 | 57.0 | 56.6 | 48.8 | 51.5 |
| 2 | 43.5 | 44.2 | 42.8 | 34.9 | 38.1 |
| 3 | 50.9 | 53.3 | 52.3 | 44.4 | 49.7 |
| 4 | 39.4 | 38.7 | 37.3 | 35.1 | 38.3 |
| 5 | 46.5 | 48.8 | 46.4 | 39.5 | 43.6 |
| 6 | 47.7 | 50.6 | 49.6 | 41.8 | 44.9 |
| 7 | 57.9 | 58.9 | 56.6 | 49.0 | 51.9 |
| 8 | 46.4 | 47.3 | 43.8 | 36.1 | 39.4 |
| 9 | 49.3 | 52.3 | 49.3 | 39.2 | 44.0 |
| 10 | 50.0 | 51.1 | 49.1 | 39.9 | 44.8 |
| 11 | 44.0 | 45.2 | 43.6 | 37.7 | 42.1 |

4. Can we identify the reasons why people do not use services?

In the enrollee survey, we asked everyone about problems that might cause them to delay or not use family planning services. Inconvenience of the appointment and perceived cost were the biggest reasons.

Table 4.4. Reasons for Delay Among Those who Did not Use Family Planning Services

| | Demo Year 1 | Demo Year 2 | Demo Year 3-4 | Demo Year 5 |
|---|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| N | 536 | 482 | 171 | 365 |
| Reason for Delay - No provider in the area that you wanted to see | 5.0% | 11.8% | 10.1% | 14.4% |
| Reason for Delay - Couldn't reach provider on | 5.9% | 8.3% | 5.3% | 10.8% |

| | Demo Year 1 | Demo Year 2 | Demo Year 3-4 | Demo Year 5 |
|---|-------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| the telephone | | | | |
| Reason for Delay - Couldn't get appointment soon enough | 9.9% | 11.2% | 10.9% | 13.8% |
| Reason for Delay - Had to wait too long at appointment | 14.0% | 15.0% | 18.3% | 22.0% |
| Reason for Delay - Office was not open when convenient | 7.4% | 7.1% | 10.4% | 6.8% |
| Reason for Delay - No transportation | 8.1% | 12.8% | 10.3% | 10.5% |
| Reason for Delay - Family or partner did not want her to go | 1.0% | 1.6% | 3.3% | 2.2% |
| Reason for Delay - No childcare | 7.0% | 7.0% | 8.5% | 6.8% |
| Reason for Delay - No money to pay for appointment | 21.7% | 24.1% | 31.4% | 21.9% |
| Reason for Delay – Not like family planning exam | na | na | 12.4% | 11.2% |

Last year I also looked at these responses, comparing those who did and did not know they were enrolled in the waiver. Awareness of enrollment definitely reduces perceived financial barriers and also facilitates perception of more convenient providers, perhaps by directing people to Plan First provider participants.

Table 4.5. Reasons for Delay among those who were and were not aware of their Plan First Enrollment.

| | Total N = 945 | Know they are enrolled in Plan First N = 716 | Did not Know they are enrolled in Plan First N = 229 |
|---|------------------|---|---|
| Reason for Delay - No provider in the area that you wanted to see | 11.4% | 10.4% | 14.7% |
| Reason for Delay - Couldn't reach provider on the telephone | 10.1% | 8.9% | 13.8%* |
| Reason for Delay - Couldn't get appointment soon enough | 13.2% | 11.9% | 17.2%* |
| Reason for Delay – Had to wait too long at appointment | 22.9% | 21.1% | 28.4%* |
| Reason for Delay - Office was not open when convenient | 7.0% | 7.3% | 6.9% |
| Reason for Delay - No transportation | 7.1% | 8.6% | 6.6% |
| Reason for Delay - Family or partner did not want her to go | 1.5% | 1.4% | 1.7% |
| Reason for Delay - No childcare | 5.8% | 5.5% | 6.5% |

| | Total N = 945 | Know they are enrolled in Plan First N = 716 | Did not Know they are enrolled in Plan First N = 229 |
|--|------------------|--|---|
| Reason for Delay - No money to pay for appointment | 15.4% | 12.4% | 24.6%** |
| Reason for Delay – Not like family planning exam | 9.0% | 8.5% | 10.5% |

* p < .05 difference between those aware and not aware of enrollment

** p < .01 difference between those aware and not aware of enrollment