Southern Rural Access Program Spring Meeting Memphis, TN April 24, 2003

Using Community Survey Results to Influence:

Early Results of the SRAP Evaluation's Access-to-Care Survey

Donald Pathman, Samruddhi Thaker, Jennifer Groves, Jennifer Albright, for the SRAP Evaluation Team UNC-Chapel Hill



- update on program logics and report data
- understanding and measuring access to care
- early findings from SRAP access survey



- all logic models are completed: thanks!
- progress reports are coming in regularly

Phase II Program Logics and Progress Report Data

- all logic models are completed: thanks!
- progress reports are coming in regularly
- *** evaluation team will only be tracking outcome objectives
 - we refined which objectives we will track as outcomes
 - includes approximately 1/3 of objectives



NPO will monitor progress on all objectives



- NPO will monitor progress on all objectives
- Why the focus?
 - progress in implementation is primarily an issue of SRAP management, not evaluation
 - to allow the evaluation to focus on monitoring outcomes and impact (health professionals, access indicators)
 - implementation success is generally accepted



- Whether targeted number of participants completed a program. [dose]
- Whether participants learned what was intended. [knowledge/attitudes]
- Whether subsequent careers and choices changed.
 [behavior]



Access to Health Care



- Fundamental to notions of people's health and equality in health and health care
- One of the three basic measures of a sound health care system: access, quality, cost
- THE focus of the SRAP
- Central to all of *our* work and personal goals



But what is it?



Number of visits to practitioners ("realized access") Anderson and Aday



- Number of visits to practitioners ("realized access")
 Anderson and Aday
- Absence of barriers to needed care
 Donabedian



- Number of visits to practitioners ("realized access")
 Anderson and Aday
- Absence of barriers to needed care
 Donabedian
- Number of visits, *plus* timeliness and quality of care IOM



How do we know when access is good?



- How do we know when access is good?
- What measures should be used to evaluate access?
 - regular source of care?
 - # of office visits?
 - having health insurance?
 - quality of care?



There is no gold standard in the access measurement field"

Survey questions should match the purpose for which the data are to be used.

(Jim Knickman, Health Affairs, 1998)



Access has many dimensions that should be measured



Access has many dimensions that should be measured

Access should be assessed with respect to:

- a specific type of health service
- a relatively recent past period of time
- for specific individuals, not families
- for specific groups



Health Care Access Survey in the SRAP Evaluation



- Why?
 - Foundation wanted outcomes demonstrated.
 - including measures of communities' access
 - program effects can only be guessed at unless formally measured



- Why?
 - Foundation wanted outcomes demonstrated.
 - No data available from other sources.



- Why?
 - Foundation wanted outcomes demonstrated.
 - No data available from other sources.
 - all available national data do not allow state, substate or rural assessments (MEPS, NHIS)



- Why?
 - Foundation wanted outcomes demonstrated.
 - No data available from other sources.
 all available national data do not allow state, substate or rural assessments (MEPS, NHIS)
 - Healthy People 2010: "The availability of data . . . may be somewhat limited at the State level and it represents a substantial challenge for measurement at the local level."



- Why?
 - Foundation wanted outcomes demonstrated.
 - No data available from other sources.
 - Opportunity for something a little new.



- Why?
 - Foundation wanted outcomes demonstrated.
 - No data available from other sources.
 - Opportunity for something a little new.
 - gather within-state, rural-specific access data for contiguous US states
 - assemble a wide array of data on access to outpatient medical services



- Why?
 - Foundation wanted outcomes demonstrated.
 - No data available from other sources.
 - Opportunity for something a little new.
 - Hoped detailed access data would be useful to SRAP grantees in planning and evaluation.



- Telephone survey; P.R.C., Inc. of Omaha
- 600 adults in SRAP-targeted rural counties of each state (4,800 total)
- English and Spanish
- November 2002 May 2003
- Follow-up survey ~ 2005-6



Target population:

- 150 rural counties (omitted 7 urban counties)
- 2.52M adult population
- 19.6% adults below poverty
- **36.7%** African Americans
- 2.4% Hispanics



- Access to outpatient routine care (mostly primary care)
- For adults
- Over past year
- Used items from previous national surveys, published studies, and some new items





- Data presented today
 - 4,237 respondents to date
 - 506 to 573 respondents per state
 - 50% overall response rate; 44% to 55% per state



- Gender
 - 66% female

Age

■ 21% <u>></u> 65 y

- Race-ethnicity
 - 28% African American
 - 1.9% Hispanics

- Misc.
 - 18% < high school degree</p>
 - 54% married
 - 6.6% unemployed



All data are weighted for gender, age and county size.



- All data are weighted for gender, age and county size.
- Not age-adjusted.



- All data are weighted for gender, age and county size.
- Not age-adjusted.

Caution!!

- Data are brand new
- We're new handling these data



- *Yourstate* is an actual SRAP state
- Data shown will be this state's actual findings
- Is it your state?


Yourstate: Realized Access Indicators

% w/ a doctor visit in past year

Average # doctor visits in past year



Yourstate: Realized Access Indicators

% who did not get needed health care in past year

% who delayed needed health care in past year



* MEPS question was "difficulty or delays in obtaining care"

Yourstate: Perceptions of Access

% who believe it is difficult to get routine health care

% who believe it is getting harder to get needed care

... easier to get needed care







% not confident that doc will be of help

% dissatisfied w/quality of care

% dissatisfied w/ care overall





% dissatisfied w/ concern shown

% dissatisfied w/ getting questions answered

% dissatisfied w/ feeling unwelcome & uncomfortable



Yourstate: Quality of care received

% who had routine check-up in past year

% w/ cholesterol check within past 5 years



Yourstate: Quality of care received

% over 64 y with flu shot in past year

% over 54 y who have ever had sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy







% uninsured (among < 65 y.o.)

% w/o usual source of care

% who prefer selftreatment





% rating it difficult to get appt within 1-2 days

% rating it difficult to reach physician by phone

Mean wait time in office (minutes)





% perceive too few local physicians

Mean travel time to office (minutes)

% rating travel to office as difficult



% perceiving race/ethnicity is a barrier to care in community



Reasons given for not getting or postponing needed care:

Yourstate (n=117)

- Did not want to go
- Cost
- No time/Too busy
- Couldn't get appt quickly
- Transportation
- Waited to see if I got better
- Employer

Reasons given for not getting or postponing needed care:

Yourstate (n=117)

- Did not want to go (29)
- Cost (23)
- No time/Too busy (17)
- Couldn't get appt quickly
- Transportation
- Waited to see if I got better
- Employer

All SRAP states (n=1436)

Cost (416)

- Did not want to go (282)
- No time/too busy (203)
- Waited to see if I got better
- Transportation
- No insurance
- Couldn't get appt quickly
- Do not like going to doctors

Perceived greatest changes needed for local health care system:

Yourstate

- No changes (n=77)
- More doctors (n=69)
- Transportation (n=39)
- Costs of care (n=29)
- Prompter care (n=22)

Perceived greatest changes needed for local health care system:

Yourstate

- No changes (n=77)
- More doctors (69)
- Transportation (39)
- Costs of care (29)
- Prompter care (22)

All SRAP states

- No changes (n=849)
- More doctors (602)
- Costs of care (416)
- Transportation (194)



- Compared to other adults in the US and/or Southeast, adults of the Yourstate like to doctor and do so relatively often, yet feel they would go even more often if not for barriers.
- Although they generally have a usual source of care, they travel somewhat further to get there and feel there aren't enough physicians locally.



- They are generally satisfied with the customer service they receive, but have concerns about the quality of care and whether their physicians will help their problems. Some prevention service rates are, indeed, low.
- Their own attitudes about doctoring and about the convenience and logics of getting care--all personal issues--are important self-reported barriers.
- Lack of insurance and racial barriers are also significant issues.



- Further evaluate quality of care in region; address quality if confirmed to be a problem.
- Design consumer education interventions to teach:
 - when doctoring is appropriate.
 - appropriate self-care for when one chooses not to see a doctor.
 - how to advocate for one's health needs when seeing a doctor.
- Expand health insurance coverage.
- Clarify and address racial barriers to care.



- Age-adjust analyses.
- Sub-group analyses
 - race
 - smallest rural counties
 - poorest counties or individuals
 - elderly
- Complete search for comparison data.



How should these data be made available to individual states/grantees?