

## Family Planning Medicaid Waiver Evaluators Conference Call

June 11, 2012, 1:00-2:00 pm EDT

### Participants

Evaluators: Janet Bronstein, Kari White (AL); Dave Murday (SC)

State Staff: Brenda McCormick (FL); Bernie Operario and Marcia Swartz (NC); Margaret Major (TN)

Other: Adam Sonfield (Guttmacher Institute); Julie DeClerque, and Ellen Shanahan (Sheps Center)

### MINUTES

Approval of Minutes: Minutes of the May meeting were approved, with no changes, for posting on the public side of the website.

#### Update on Work on Title X Guidelines

The group discussed the OPA slides (sent previously to group and on website), and summary of OPA guideline revision work. The process includes focus on FP program indicators that we have been discussing re: access, quality, outcomes. There is potential opportunity to give feedback from our work that may help inform their decisions re: essential elements, appropriate outcomes indicators, as well as process indicators. We might offer our findings as part of their feedback loop, phase I already occurred (first draft in Nov 2011)... and so we would be in last cycle for revision (March)? Has second draft of guidelines been circulated and so has Title X comment period passed?

Where are they in the process, and is there some usefulness in offering our advice at this point? Bernie is interested, and was involved peripherally in the revision process 20 years ago...Margaret will ask Susan and Kelly in TN to see if they have any updates. (*Update:* No! Nothing presented at last week's Title X meeting.) Adam, said he's unsure about the process, and that generally speaking the indicators they disseminate and require will be fairly basic. Assuming there is the opportunity still to comment, let's continue to see where they are in the process and offer our work. *Update:* there have not been any formal comment periods so far (either among Title X staff or wider public/stakeholder groups. The process has been more closed than originally described in slides we reviewed. One possible avenue would be to go directly to Sue Moskosky / Laurie Gavin and share a document summarizing our findings from across our waivers over time, organized by Janet's categories?

*Question:* Did Jeff end up presenting his work at the conference on impact of birth spacing? Janet is working on effect eligibility has on enrollment and disenrollment process and the impact it has had. Dave pointed out that this is exactly what we might be able to do as a group: replicate methods one of us has used in our work to investigate a common concern, and examine same question across other programs. Janet also mentioned looking at those who have been in and out and patterns of program enrollment overtime. What predicts enrollment? And then, what predicts re-enrollment? In other words, look at *episodes* of enrollment. Annually re-enrollment (rather than presumptive). Janet shows that many more are active contraceptors who reenroll. Better measures for outcome-related rates if the focus is on *annual reenrollment* (we get the

active, motivated contraceptors). How many people ended up not being a contraceptive user because of barrier to re-enroll? “Churning” as an issue that is important, both for program assessment in terms of who is getting services and whether they are of good quality, etc. But also, it’s important for policy in terms of delineating insurance riders, for example, and knowing numbers of who enrolls and numbers to expect. Example: “Our participation rates typically hover around 50%,” but once you shift to annual re-enrollment (and not rolling enrollment) and get a more concentrated user group enrolled, it may shift the costs and profile of the population being covered.”

Maybe we can go back to the list Janet had devised and see which indicators were of most interest to enough states to pursue as a group. Next step is to work out methods (as Janet had mentioned on our call today for the “churning” issue, for example), and start working out measures, data programming we can share. Attached is the list with three columns, 1) states who previously indicated they had data for that particular topic/question/indicators; 2) whether you currently are calculating any measure for that item; and 3) if you already have some findings, and can share your analytic methods, measures, or preliminary data (ex: FL and birth spacing) and if you would suggest improving/changing approach.

Also, as we move through this, we want to keep track of any other questions that bubble up through the process. For example, *Developing insurance exchanges: what are the questions policy makers are asking?* (Ruth Eudy in AR might have some feedback about their process).

<http://www.guttmacher.org/pubs/Family-planning-SPA.pdf>

One thing we may want to examine is, what will Medicaid be reimbursing providers for (6-12 month supplies for pill)? And are these things lining up with the guidelines in terms of what clinicians are supposed to be doing? Look at caveats in ACA re: medical homes, patient-centered outcomes provisions, as these are what they are focusing on—long-term.

Next call: July call will be cancelled. Instead we will circulate emails among the group re: feedback we get from Title X staff (item I) and feedback from evaluators re: Janet’s list and possible work underway (or planned) (item II). Next call August 13th at 1:00 pm EDT, noon CDT. Call in number is (919) 962-2740.