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Background

• Over 2,000 Clinics
  – Title X-funded (~15%)
  – Non-Title X Public (~30%)
  – Private (~55%)
• Over 1.8 million clients
  – Title X-funded (over 50%)
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Family Planning, Access, Care, and Treatment (Family PACT) Data

Medi-Cal MIS/DSS (Optum)

Family PACT Data

Client Enrollment

Provider Enrollment

Fee-for-Service Medical Claims

“Provider” = NPI, Owner Number and Location Number

All FDA-approved contraception, STI test/treat, and limited cancer screening
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Qualitative comments:

“In the past this data was critical in making the case that our clinic could support an adolescent only department. It made the case and we’ve been successful as a result, expanding it over the last three years and looking to expand hours again shortly.”

- Title X-Funded Clinician Provider in Los Angeles County
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Family PACT Data

Medi-Cal MIS/DSS (Optum)

Family PACT Data

Client Enrollment

Provider Enrollment

Fee-for-Service Medical Claims

Combined and stored on a SAS server for each fiscal year (FY) since 1997 (~15 million records this FY)
Family PACT Data

Medi-Cal MIS/DSS (Optum)

Family PACT Data

Client Enrollment
Provider Enrollment
Fee-for-Service Medical Claims

In house clinician provider database
External data

Provider Profile Background

Quality Improvement and Utilization Management (QI/UM) Metrics

• First semi-annual set of “profiles” was distributed by mail in 2005
• Now nine QI/UM indicators
• Retrievable online 2007
• “Paperless option” 2008

Background

Family PACT “QI/UM” Provider Profile

• Model starting point for national meaningful use reproductive health indicators
• A provider feedback loop is an essential component


Client Demographic Provider Profile

• First released Summer 2011
• Give providers opportunities to better understand their client population and client trends over time
• Only available to view and download from the Family PACT website (www.familypact.org)
• Encourage providers to ‘go paperless’
• Feedback survey started Sept 2012

Feedback Respondents (n=27)

• From 12 of 58 California Counties
• By Primary Role in Family PACT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>41%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provider: Clinical staff</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provider: Administrative staff</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Title X-Funded Family PACT Provider (41%)
• Used Methods and Interpretation document? (33% yes)
• Seen Demographic Profile before? (50% yes)

Preliminary Data
Page 1: Pie Charts

Four pie charts about the provider’s clients in the most recent fiscal year period

- At least 50 served
- Min 15 per slice
- Max 10 slices
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Which was the most useful?

- #1: 50%
- #2: 32%
- #3: 14%
- #4: 0%

Page 1: Pie Charts

Preliminary Data

Page 2: Trends

Four bar charts about the provider’s clients in the most recent four fiscal years

- Min 15 per bar
- Max 4 bars

Page 2: Trends

Which was the most useful?

- #1: 46%
- #2: 27%
- #3: 23%
- #4: 0%
How you use or may use the Demographic Profile?

1. Outreach, advertising, or intervention (59.1%)
2. Grant application or funding proposal (45.5%)
3. Compare two or more clinics (45.5%)
4. Linguistic or cultural competency efforts (40.9%)
5. Staff orientation or training (40.9%)
6. Ordering educational materials in appropriate languages (40.9%)
7. Clinic hours, location, and/or staffing (27.3%)
8. I don’t think we will use it at all (4.5%)
9. Other comments, please specify (36.4%) . .

Preliminary Data

Qualitative comments:

“It would be so much more helpful if the data were more timely. . .”
- Clinician Provider in Los Angeles County

“Zip code chart is not stratified by race/ethnicity which would be helpful for our targeted interventions. . .”
- Family PACT Stakeholder in Contra Costa County

Discussion

- Model start point for organizing EHR data
- Useful to both Providers and Stakeholders
- Uniform clinic-to-clinic reporting
- Family PACT (Family Planning Clients)
- Few know about the Demographic Profile
- Work to be done opting to go “paperless”

Thank you.
Questions?
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