

PERINATAL HEALTH PARTNERS

ANNUAL EVALUATION



JULY 1, 2014 – JUNE 30, 2015

Prepared by

**Stuart H. Tedders, PhD
Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health
Georgia Southern University**

December 2015

**Perinatal Health Partners
Annual Program Evaluation
(July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015)**



**Prepared by:
Stuart H. Tedders, PhD
Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health
Georgia Southern University
December 2015**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Executive Summary	6
II.	Methods.....	8
III.	Programmatic Outcomes.....	9
	a. Demographic Profile of PHP Participants	9
	b. Referral and Assessment.....	11
	c. Prior Birth Outcomes	13
	d. Birth Outcomes for Period of Evaluation	14
	e. Referral Close	16
IV.	Process Evaluation of Providers, Patients, and Staff	17
	a. Provider Satisfaction.....	17
	b. Patient Satisfaction.....	18
	c. Staff Satisfaction.....	21
V.	Summary.....	23
VI.	Appendices.....	24

LIST OF TABLES

- Table 1: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by County
- Table 2: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Age
- Table 3: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Race
- Table 4: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Marital Status
- Table 5: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Education
- Table 6: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Employment Status
- Table 7: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Method of Payment
- Table 8: Distribution of Referring Diagnosis
- Table 9: Past Gynecologic History of Enrolled PHP Patients
- Table 10: Maternal History of Enrolled PHP Patients
- Table 11: Obstetric History Enrolled PHP Patients
- Table 12: Mean Birth Weight and Gestational Length of Previous Deliveries
- Table 13: Distribution of Previous Low Birth Weight Births
- Table 14: Distribution of Births by Weight and Gestation
- Table 15: Distribution of Low Birth Weight Births
- Table 16: Distribution of Gestational Age of Births
- Table 17: Distribution of Births by Gender
- Table 18: Distribution of Births by Race
- Table 19: Distribution of Several Birth Indicators
- Table 20: Distribution of Referral Close Reason
- Table 21: Descriptive Analysis of Provider Satisfaction with PHP Staff
- Table 22: Descriptive Analysis of Provider Satisfaction with PHP Program

Table 23: Descriptive Analysis of Provider Satisfaction with PHP Program

Table 24: Descriptive Analysis of Frequency of Interaction with PHP Program

Table 25: Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Traits of PHP Patients Completing Surveys

Table 26: Descriptive Analysis of Patient Satisfaction with PHP Staff Encounters

Table 27: Descriptive Analysis of Patient Satisfaction with PHP Program

Table 28: Descriptive Analysis of Patient Satisfaction with PHP Nurses

Table 29: Descriptive Analysis of Patient Satisfaction with PHP Care

Table 30: Descriptive Analysis of Patient Satisfaction with PHP Program Services

Table 31: Descriptive Analysis of Staff Description of Their Work with PHP Program Services

Table 32: Descriptive Analysis of Staff Satisfaction with PHP Job Elements

Table 33: Descriptive Analysis of Staff Satisfaction with PHP Supervisors and Managers

Executive Summary

Programmatic Outcomes

Demographic Profile

- ✦ A total of 195 women were served by the PHP program from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015.
- ✦ Most women served by the PHP program reside in either Coffee County (44.1%) or Ware County (13.8%).
- ✦ The mean age of all women served by the PHP program is 28.3 years. Approximately 58.5% of all PHP participants are between 20 and 29 years old.
- ✦ Approximately 50.3% of women served by the PHP program are white.
- ✦ A demographic profile of women served by the PHP indicates that 36.9% are black, 9.7% are Hispanic, and 3.1% classified themselves as other races.
- ✦ Approximately 52.8% of women are single.
- ✦ 23.1% of women have less than a 12th grade education. 39.5% of women have only a high school diploma.
- ✦ 55.4% of women are unemployed.
- ✦ 42.1% of women are Medicaid recipients.

Referral and Assessment

- ✦ The top five reasons for referral include preexisting medical conditions, diabetes, prior premature delivery, prior miscarriage, and prior preterm labor accounting for 76.7% of all diagnoses.
- ✦ Hypertension (17.9%) was the most prevalent condition based on maternal history of women.
- ✦ The average gestational age at referral was 7.2 weeks.

Prior Birth Outcomes

- ✦ Among women in the PHP program, a mean birth weight of 2882.7 grams was recorded for previous pregnancies.
- ✦ The mean gestational length was 27.4 weeks for previous pregnancies.
- ✦ 25.8% of previous births were low birth weight births.

Birth Outcomes for Period of Evaluation

- ✦ 110 live births occurred from July 1, 2014 – June 30, 2015.

- ✦ These births had a mean weight of 3015.6 grams and a mean gestational age of 37.6 weeks.
- ✦ When considering only singleton births, the mean birth weight was 3050.8 grams and the mean gestational length was 37.6 weeks.
- ✦ 17.3% of all births were low birth weight.
- ✦ When considering only singleton births, 14.4% of births were classified as low birth weight.
- ✦ 75.4% of all births had a gestational length between 37 and 39 weeks.
- ✦ Of the 110 births occurring throughout the year, 45.5% were males and 54.5% were females.
- ✦ 7 infants (6.4%) were transferred to the intensive care unit.
- ✦ 8.2% of births had jaundice, 5.5% had abnormal blood sugar, and 2.7% of births had reported assisted ventilation.
- ✦ Three infant deaths were recorded (2.7%).
- ✦ Service was completed on 45.6% of cases.
- ✦ 7.7% of referrals were lost to follow up and 0.5% of referrals refused service.

Program Satisfaction

- ✦ Patient satisfaction surveys indicate a very high level of satisfaction for all elements assessed.

From an evaluation standpoint, the health-related outcomes demonstrate effective programmatic functioning. The PHP program continues to reach and provide a valuable pre- and postnatal service to many high-risk women. Particularly commendable is the number of women served who are the most vulnerable in the community, including minorities and poorly educated populations. It is evident that the PHP has improved outcomes related to birth weight and gestational length based on prior obstetric history. Moreover, it is evident that PHP staff members are very effective managing these high-risk populations as indicated through satisfaction surveys. It is recommended that PHP staff attempt to follow-up with patients who refused service for the purpose of more accurately assessing women's hesitation in participating. The purpose of this follow-up would be to more accurately assess women's hesitation in participating, thereby possibly improving programmatic outcomes. In addition, the evaluator recommends additional data gathering among enrollees and a comparison group (non-enrollees) to more effectively assess differences in attitude and perception of prenatal care. In short, outcomes associated with the PHP program evaluation are excellent.

Methods

Programmatic Outcomes

Data for PHP patients are currently tracked and entered in a Microsoft Access database by program personnel. For the purposes of this evaluation, a password protected, electronic copy of this database was sent to the Jiann-Ping Hsu College of Public Health (JPHCOPH) at Georgia Southern University. All identifying information was removed from this database prior to sending to the JPHCOPH. Five data tables were extracted from this database and formed the basis of the evaluation. Specific variables provided to evaluators can be found in Appendix 1. Descriptive analysis of select variables is included in this report.

For the purposes of analysis and reporting, annual participation in the PHP program was defined as having some level of recorded activity from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015. Specific criteria for determining participation included the following:

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">✓ At least one recorded assessment during the assessment period; or✓ A recorded delivery date during the assessment period; or |
|---|

Satisfaction Surveys

Patient satisfaction is assessed using a survey developed by PHP program personnel. In addition, provider satisfaction and staff satisfaction surveys were administered. Completed surveys were forwarded to the JPHCOPH at Georgia Southern University where data were entered and descriptively analyzed using SPSS® for Windows.

Programmatic Outcomes

According to data provided by the PHP program, 195 women met the inclusion criteria from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015. Active participation in this program was defined as having recorded activity (assessment) or having given birth during the evaluation period.

Demographic Profile of PHP Participants

The following section highlights specific demographic information gleaned from this population of women. County of residence is illustrated in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by County

COUNTY	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Appling	13	6.7
Atkinson	15	7.7
Bacon	21	10.8
Charlton	1	0.5
Clinch	8	4.1
Coffee	86	44.1
Jeff Davis	13	6.7
Pierce	8	4.1
Ware	27	13.8
Wayne	3	1.5
Total	195	100

Most women served by the PHP program resided in either Coffee County (44.1%) or Ware County (13.8%)

The distribution of all PHP enrollees by age is illustrated in the table below in Table 2.

Table 2: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Age

AGE CATEGORY	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
<20	8	4.1
20 – 24	47	24.1
25 – 29	67	34.4
30 – 34	39	20.0
35 – 39	28	14.4
>= 40	6	3.1
Total	195	100

The mean age of all women served by the PHP program is 28.3 years. Approximately 58.5% of all PHP participants are either 20 – 24 years (24.1) or 25 – 29 years (34.4) old. Women less than 20 (4.1%), 30 – 34 (20.0%) or 35 – 39 (14.4%) comprise 38.5% of the population. Only 3.1% of women enrolled in the PHP program were 40 years old or older.

The distribution of participants by race/ethnicity is illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Race

RACE/ETHNICITY	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Black	72	36.9
White	98	50.3
Hispanic	19	9.7
Other*	6	3.1
Total	195	100

*Denoted as multi-racial, American Indian-Alaskan Native, or Asian

The majority of women served by the PHP program are white (50.3%). However, 36.9% of women are black and 9.7% of subjects classify themselves as Hispanic. Approximately 3.1% of women report their race to be multi-racial, American Indian/Alaskan Native, or Asian.

The distribution of participants by marital status is illustrated in Table 4.

Table 4: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Marital Status

MARITAL STATUS	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Married	79	40.5
Divorced	8	4.1
Separated	5	2.6
Single	103	52.8
Total	195	100

Most women (52.8%) served by the PHP program reported being single. Approximately, 47.2% of women report being married (40.5%), divorced (4.1%), or separated (2.6%).

The distribution of educational level of PHP participants is illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Education

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
< High School	45	23.1
High School	77	39.5
>= Junior College	40	20.5
Technical College	26	13.3
Educated Outside the US	6	3.1
Not Reported	1	0.5
Total	195	100

According to the data provided, 23.1% of women reported having less than a high school education. In addition, only 39.5% of women reported having only a high school education. Of the remaining participants, 20.5% reported having experiences at the Junior College, College, or Post-Graduate level. Approximately 13.3% of enrolled women had some technical college training, and 3.1% of patients were educated outside the US. Data were not available for 0.5% of PHP clients.

The distribution of PHP enrollment by employment status is illustrated in Table 6.

Table 6: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Employment Status

EMPLOYMENT STATUS	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Full-Time	51	26.2
Part-Time	22	11.3
Self Employed	2	1.0
Student	10	5.1
Unemployed	108	55.4
Not Reported	2	1.0
Total	195	100

According to the data, 55.4% of all PHP participants report being unemployed. However, 26.2% of women work full-time and 11.3% work part-time. Approximately 5.1% of PHP participants report being students. Data were not available for 1.0% of PHP clients.

The distribution of PHP enrollment by method of payment is illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7: Distribution of PHP Enrollment by Method of Payment

METHOD OF PAYMENT	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
AmeriGroup	16	8.2
Insurance	19	9.7
Medicaid	82	42.1
Wellcare	55	28.2
Peach State	11	5.6
Other/None	12	6.2
Total	195	100

Approximately 70.3% of PHP participants are recipients of either Medicaid (42.1%) or Wellcare (28.2%).

Referral and Assessment

The following section provides information with respect to why women were referred into the PHP program. Based on an analysis of data, the average gestational age at referral was 7.2 weeks at referral.

Patients may have been referred for multiple reasons, so the proportional distribution of referral reasons is only illustrated in Table 8.

Table 8: Distribution of Referring Diagnosis

REFERRING DIAGNOSIS	PERCENT
Pre-Existing Medical Conditions	26.7
Prior Preterm Labor	11.6
Prior Miscarriage (2 or More) SAB	10.1
PIH – Pre-eclampsia	4.1

Diabetes – Gestational, Type I, Type II	8.2
Preterm Labor	2.8
Prior Premature Delivery or PROM	20.1
Prior Fetal/Neonatal Death	6.6
Fetal Abnormality (Current Pregnancy)	0.3
Multiple Gestation with Complications	0.9
Prior 2 nd Trimester Pregnancy Loss	3.8
Prior Fetal Abnormality	1.3
Incompetent Cervix	1.9
Miscarriage – 2 nd Trimester Pregnancy Loss	1.6

The top five reasons for referral include preexisting medical conditions, prior premature delivery, prior miscarriage, prior preterm labor, and diabetes 76.7% of all diagnoses.

Table 9: Past Gynecologic History of Enrolled PHP Patients

INDICATOR	MEAN
Age at First Menses	12.4
Age at First Sexual Encounter	16.4

The mean age of first menses among PHP enrollees was 12.4 years (Table 9). Moreover, the mean age at first sexual encounter was 16.4 years.

Maternal history of women enrolled in the PHP program is illustrated in Table 10.

Table 10: Maternal History of Enrolled PHP Patients

INDICATOR	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Cardiac	9	4.6
Renal	3	1.5
Diabetes	12	6.2
Hypertension	35	17.9
Congenital Anomalies	10	5.1
Lupus	3	1.5
Thyroid Disease	12	6.2
Blood Clot Disorder	4	2.1

Table 10 indicates that hypertension (17.9%) was the most prevalent condition based on maternal history of women.

Table 11: Obstetric History Enrolled PHP Patients

INDICATOR	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Placenta Previa	11	5.6
Pre-term with Live Pre-term Birth	65	33.3
Pre-term with Live Term Birth	28	14.4
Prior Fetal Death	23	11.8
> 2 Abortions	34	17.4

Incompetent Cervix	6	3.1
Cervical Anomaly	3	1.5
C-Section or VBACS	60	30.8
Eclampsia	42	21.5
IUGR	3	1.5
Infant > 9 Pounds	6	3.1
< 1 Year Since Last Birth	24	12.3
Infant Congenital Anomaly	12	6.2
Gestational Diabetes	21	10.8
Prior Low Birth Weight	28	14.4

According to the obstetric history of women served throughout the year, 33.3% were designated as “Pre-term with Live Pre-term Birth” (Table 11). The proportion of women having a C-section or vaginal birth after C-section (30.8%), Eclampsia (21.5%), pre-term with live term birth (14.4%), or greater than two abortions (17.4%) was significant among PHP clients.

Prior Birth Outcomes

Previous birth outcomes as indicated by the participant pregnancy history are illustrated in Tables 12 and 13.

Table 12: Mean Birth Weight and Gestational Length of Previous Deliveries

INDICATOR	MEAN
Mean Birth Weight of Previous Deliveries	2882.7 grams
Mean Weeks Gestation of Previous Deliveries	27.4 weeks

Among women participating in the PHP program, a mean birth weight of 2882.7 grams was recorded for previous pregnancies. Moreover, mean gestational length for these women was 27.4 weeks.

Table 13: Distribution of Previous Low Birth Weight Births

WEIGHT CATEGORY	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Previous Low Birth Weight Births	80	25.8
Previous Normal Birth Weight Births	230	74.2
Total	310	100

According to Table 13, 25.8% of previous births to women currently enrolled in the PHP program were low birth weight births.

Birth Outcomes for Period of Evaluation

The following section outlines a variety of birth indicators as observed at the end of the first year of program implementation. Among the 195 women participating in the PHP program, 110 live births occurred from July 1, 2014 through June 30, 2015.

Data indicate these births had a mean birth weight of 3015.6 grams and a mean gestational age of 37.6 weeks (Table 14). After controlling for multiple births, the recorded mean birth weight and gestational length of singleton births was 3050.8 grams and 37.6 weeks, respectively.

Table 14: Distribution of Births by Weight and Gestation

BIRTH INDICATOR	FREQUENCY	MEAN
Birth Weight of All Births	110	3015.6 grams
Gestational Length of All Births	110	37.6 weeks
Birth Weight After Removing Multiple Births	104	3050.8 grams
Gestational Length After Removing Multiple Births	104	37.6 weeks

Table 15 illustrates the proportion of low birth weight births. These data indicate that 17.3 of all recorded births were less than 2500 grams. However, the proportion of low birth weight births is reduced considerably (14.4%) after controlling for the effects of multiple births.

Table 15: Distribution of Low Birth Weight Births

WEIGHT CATEGORY	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Low Birth Weight of All Births	19	17.3
Normal Birth Weight of All Births	91	82.7
Total	110	100
Low Birth Weight After Removing Multiple Births	15	14.4
Normal Birth Weight After Removing All Births	89	85.6
Total	104	100

The distribution of all gestational length of all births occurring at year's end is presented in Table 16.

Table 16: Distribution of Gestational Age of Births

GESTATIONAL AGE (WEEKS)	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
<=33	9	8.1
34	0	0.0
35	1	0.9
36	8	7.3
37	12	10.9
38	35	31.8
39	36	32.7
40	7	6.4
41	2	1.8
Total	110	100

Approximately 75.4% of all births had a gestational length between 37 and 39 weeks.

The distribution of births by gender is presented in Table 17.

Table 17: Distribution of Births by Gender

GENDER	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Female	60	54.5
Male	50	45.5
Total	110	100

Of the 110 births occurring during the year of program implementation, 45.5% were males and 54.5% were females.

The distribution of births by race is presented in Table 18.

Table 18: Distribution of Births by Race

GENDER	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Black	39	35.5
White	52	47.3
Hispanic	13	11.8
Other*	6	5.5
Total	110	100

*Denoted as multi-racial, American Indian-Alaskan Native, or Asian

According to the data presented above, 35.5% of births occurring throughout the year were black and 47.3% were white. Approximately 11.8% of the remaining births were born to Hispanic mothers.

A variety of birth indicators including Neonatal Intensive Care Unit visits, Emergency Room visits, current immunizations, and fetal/infant mortality are presented in Table 19.

Table 19: Distribution of Several Birth Indicators

INDICATOR	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Transferred to NICU	7	6.4
Infant ER Visits	0	0.0
Immunization/Check-Up Current	107	97.3
Assisted Ventilation	3	2.7
Congenital Anomalies	3	2.7
Infant Deaths	3	2.7
Anemia	0	0.0
Jaundice	9	8.2
Labor Trauma and Infection	0	0.0
Abnormal Blood Sugar	6	5.5
Injury	0	0.0
Other	6	5.5

For the year, 7 infants (6.4%) were transferred to the intensive care unit and 97.3% of infants had current immunizations. In addition, 8.2% of infants had jaundice, 5.5% had abnormal blood sugar, and 2.7% of births had reported assisted ventilation. Three infant deaths were also recorded (2.7%).

Referral Close

Table 20 illustrates the referral close reasons recorded from July 1, 2014 to June 30, 2015. Service was completed for 45.6% of participants active during the evaluation period. As indicated by the data, 7.7% of referrals were lost to follow up and 42.6% of all cases were not closed.

Table 20: Distribution of Referral Close Reason

REFERRAL CLOSE REASON	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Miscarriage	4	2.1
Out of Catchment Area	3	1.5
Refused Service	1	0.5
Service Complete	89	45.6
Lost to Follow-up	15	7.7
Case Not Closed	83	42.6
Total	195	100

Process Evaluation of Satisfaction Surveys: Providers, Patients, and Staff

The purpose of this specific portion of the evaluation report is to provide feedback of provider, patient, and staff satisfaction so that the PHP can modify its policies, services, and strategies to maximize potential outcomes. Providers, patients, and staff members completed satisfaction surveys. The surveys were forwarded to evaluators for analysis. This report briefly summarizes these data. Detailed findings and results of the data are documented in the accompanying tables.

Provider Satisfaction

Providers were afforded the opportunity to give feedback in the areas of General Satisfaction and Frequency of Interaction with PHP staff. In addition, providers were asked to provide additional feedback about PHP staff and services in the form of open-ended questions. Data from these inquiries were aggregated, analyzed and summarized to report overall means. High satisfaction marks offered by the providers are an indication that the meeting of this goal has been achieved. Data from 9 providers completing surveys are described in detail below.

Table 21: Descriptive Analysis of Provider Satisfaction* with PHP Staff

SATISFACTION RATING	PROGRAM MEAN
Helpful	4.0
Friendly	4.0
Caring	4.0
Knowledgeable	4.0
Professional	4.0
Total	4.0

* Very Satisfied = 4; Somewhat Satisfied = 3; Somewhat Dissatisfied = 2; Very Dissatisfied = 1

Table 21 describes provider satisfaction with PHP staff traits. According to the 9 surveys analyzed, providers were satisfied with all PHP staff qualities. The mean values of all PHP traits were 4.0, thereby indicating the highest degree of satisfaction.

Table 22: Descriptive Analysis of Provider Satisfaction* with PHP Program

SATISFACTION RATING	PROGRAM MEAN
Quality of Care	4.0
Timeliness of Care	4.0
Respect to Patients	4.0
Patient Confidentiality	4.0
Follow-up Care	4.0
Provider Access	3.9
Total	4.0

* Very Satisfied = 4; Somewhat Satisfied = 3; Somewhat Dissatisfied = 2; Very Dissatisfied = 1

Table 22 illustrates the results of provider satisfaction with the PHP program. All components of this section received mean scores of 4.0. It is clear that providers have an extremely high level of satisfaction with programmatic functioning of the PHP.

Table 23: Descriptive Analysis of Provider Satisfaction* with PHP Program

SATISFACTION RATING	PROGRAM MEAN
Accessibility of PHP Staff	3.9
System of Feedback to PHP	3.8
PHP Patient Feedback	3.8
PHP Program as Asset	4.0
Total	3.9

* Strongly Agree = 4; Somewhat Agree = 3; Somewhat Disagree = 2; Strongly Disagree = 1

Table 23 is a continuation of provider satisfaction of the PHP program. The overall mean score for this section as indicated by 3.9 level of satisfaction.

Table 24: Descriptive Analysis of Frequency of Interaction with PHP Program

	MORE FREQUENT	NOT AS OFTEN	ADEQUATE	LESS OFTEN	TOTAL
PROGRAM RESULT	2 (22.2%)	0 (0.0%)	7 (77.8%)	0 (0%)	9 (100%)

According to Table 24, 77.8% of providers are satisfied with the frequency of interaction with PHP staff.

Patient Satisfaction

A total of 80 patient surveys were completed and analyzed to assess annual performance of the PHP program. The following tables and text illustrate the demographic and satisfaction trends gleaned from these surveys.

Table 25: Descriptive Analysis of Demographic Traits of PHP Patients Completing Surveys

CATEGORY	VARIABLE	NUMBER	PERCENT
Race/Ethnicity	White	39	50.0
	Black	26	33.3
	Hispanic	11	14.1
	Other	2	2.6
	Total	78	100
Number of Previous Pregnancies	0	9	11.8
	1	21	27.6
	2	13	17.1
	3	13	17.1
	4	9	11.8
	5+	11	14.5
	Total	76	100

Payor Source			
	Medicaid	67	88.2
	Uninsured	3	3.9
	Private Insurance	5	6.6
	Peachcare	1	1.3
	Total	76	100

The demographic characteristics of patients completing this survey to assess annual satisfaction are illustrated in Table 25. Most patients completing the satisfaction survey were white (50.0%). Approximately 33.3% (n = 26) clients were Black and 14.1% (n = 11) were Hispanic. Approximately 44.7% of clients reported having either 1 (27.6%) or 2 (17.1%) previous pregnancies prior to their current involvement with PHP. Most (88.2%) patients are classified as Medicaid recipients, while only 6.6% report having private insurance.

Table 26: Descriptive Analysis of Patient Satisfaction* with PHP Staff Encounters

SATISFACTION RATING	MID-PROGRAM RESULT
Helpful	4.0
Friendly	4.0
Caring	4.0
Knowledgeable	4.0
Professional	4.0
Total	4.0

* Very Satisfied = 4; Somewhat Satisfied = 3; Somewhat Dissatisfied = 2; Very Dissatisfied = 1

Table 26 illustrates the analysis of satisfaction related to client encounters with PHP staff. As indicated in the table, the overall satisfaction rating mean for the year result was 4.0.

Table 27: Descriptive Analysis of Patient Satisfaction* with PHP Program

SATISFACTION RATING	MID-PROGRAM RESULT
Quality of Care	4.0
Timeliness of Care	4.0
Respect to Patients	4.0
Patient Confidentiality	4.0
Follow-up Care	4.0
Provider Access	4.0
Total	4.0

* Very Satisfied = 4; Somewhat Satisfied = 3; Somewhat Dissatisfied = 2; Very Dissatisfied = 1

Similar to the previous table, patient satisfaction with the PHP program was extremely high (Table 27). The overall mean score for this section of the survey was 4.0 for the year.

Table 28: Descriptive Analysis of Patient Satisfaction* with PHP Nurses

SATISFACTION RATING	MID-PROGRAM RESULT
Understood What You Said	4.0
Adequate Time	4.0
Listened to Concerns	4.0
Answered Questions	4.0
Total	4.0

* Very Satisfied = 4; Somewhat Satisfied = 3; Somewhat Dissatisfied = 2; Very Dissatisfied = 1

Table 28 indicates a consistently high patient satisfaction with PHP nurses. Overall, the mean score of traits associated with nurses was 4.0.

Table 29: Descriptive Analysis of Patient Satisfaction* with PHP Care

SATISFACTION RATING	MID-PROGRAM RESULT
Nurses	4.0
Social Workers	4.0
Total	4.0

* Very Satisfied = 4; Somewhat Satisfied = 3; Somewhat Dissatisfied = 2; Very Dissatisfied = 1

According to Table 29, patients expressed a high degree of overall satisfaction with both nurses (mean = 4.0) and social workers (mean = 4.0).

Table 30: Descriptive Analysis of Patient Satisfaction* with PHP Program Services

SATISFACTION RATING	MID-PROGRAM RESULT
Clinics (HR)	4.0
Home Visits	4.0
Telemedicine	4.0
Phone Consultation	3.9
Level II Ultrasounds	3.9
Social Services	3.9
External Services	3.9
Transportation	3.9
Total	3.9

* Very Satisfied = 4; Somewhat Satisfied = 3; Somewhat Dissatisfied = 2; Very Dissatisfied = 1

Satisfaction with PHP program services is illustrated in Table 30. Overall, a total mean score of 3.9 was observed for the end-of-year analysis.

Staff Satisfaction

Staff members were afforded the opportunity to give feedback in the areas of a self-description of their work, as well as their perceived relationship with supervisors/managers. The tables below represent data collected on 5 staff members.

Table 31: Descriptive Analysis of Staff Description* of Their Work with PHP Program Services

DESCRIPTOR	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
Rewarding	2	40.0
Fulfilling	1	20.0
Challenging	3	60.0
Interesting	2	40.0
Meaningful	3	60.0
Demanding	1	20.0
Pleasant	1	20.0
Frustrating	2	40.0
Tedious	1	20.0
Complex	1	20.0
Overwhelming	1	20.0

Of the staff members completing surveys, 60.0% described their job as either challenging or meaningful (Table 31).

Table 32: Descriptive Analysis of Staff Satisfaction* with PHP Job Elements

JOB ELEMENTS	FREQUENCY	MEAN
Salary	5	2.0
Orientation to job	5	4.2
Level of self-satisfaction	5	3.8
Working conditions	5	4.2
Management's response to programmatic needs	5	3.8
Consideration of my input and insight	5	4.0
Training/skill building opportunities	5	3.2
Evidence of teamwork	5	3.0
Recognition provided for achievements and accomplishments	5	3.4
On the job training	5	3.8
Rules and policies affecting my work	5	4.0

* Excellent = 5; Good = 4; Average = 3; Fair = 2; Poor = 1

Staff satisfaction with a variety of job elements is illustrated in Table 32. Salary (mean = 2.0) received the lowest mean value of all job elements. All other job elements had relatively high mean scores.

Table 33: Descriptive Analysis of Staff Satisfaction* with PHP Supervisors and Managers

ASSESSMENT OF TYPE OF SUPERVISION	FREQUENCY	MEAN
Workload too heavy	5	3.2
Workload too light	5	3.0

Understanding of supervisor expectations	5	4.4
Receive clear instructions from PHP management	5	3.6
Supervisor/Manager availability	5	4.2
Receive feedback regarding work performance	5	4.2
Evaluation of work performance is fair and helpful	5	4.0
Management keeps me informed of changes	5	3.8
I am asked for input into decisions affecting my work	5	4.2
Supervisors/management are willing to listen	5	4.2
Feel valued by co-workers	5	3.6
Feel valued by supervisors/managers	5	3.6
Feel that I am a member of a team	5	3.0
Supervisor handles problems in a satisfactory manner	5	3.6
Management handles problems in a satisfactory manner	5	3.4
Supervisor is fair and objective	5	3.6
Management is fair and objective	5	3.8
Feel safe on my job	5	3.8

* Excellent = 5; Good = 4; Average = 3; Fair = 2; Poor = 1

As indicated in Table 33, staff members have a high degree of satisfaction with PHP supervisors and managers.

Summary

The PHP program has developed a substantial and extensive network of community partners. This network consists of providers, facilities, and community advocates. From an evaluation standpoint, the health-related outcomes demonstrate effective programmatic functioning. The PHP program continues to reach and provide a valuable pre- and postnatal service to many high-risk women. Particularly commendable is the number of women served who are the most vulnerable in the community, including minorities and poorly educated populations. It is evident that the PHP program has improved outcomes related to birth weight and gestational length based on prior obstetric histories of patients. In fact, results are statistically significant based on prior maternal history and a matched comparison. Moreover, it is evident that PHP staff members are very effective managing these high-risk populations as indicated through satisfaction surveys. The only recommendation at this point is a more complete follow-up with patients who refused service. The purpose of this follow-up would be to more accurately assess women's hesitation in participating. In addition, the evaluator recommends additional data gathering among enrollees and a comparison group (non-enrollees) to more effectively assess differences in attitude and perception of prenatal care. In short, outcomes associated with the PHP program at this point of the evaluation are excellent.

Appendix 1

PHP Data Variables

PATIENT FILE	ASSESSMENT FILE
Patient Id	Patient Id
County	MHx-Cardiac
Name – Last	MHx-Renal
Name – First	MHx-Diabetes
Name – Middle	MHx-Hypertension
Birth Date	MHx-Congenital Anomalies
SSN	MHx-Lupus
Payment Source	MHx-Thyroid Dx
Insurance Info	MHx-Blood Clot Disorder
Medicaid Nbr	MHx-Other
Primary Language	OBHx-Placenta Previa
Race	OBHx-Preterm w/live Preterm Birth
Marital Status	OBHx-Preterm w/live Preterm Count
Phone – Home	OBHx-Preterm w/live Term Birth
Phone – Work	OBHx-Preterm w/live Term Count
Phone – Other	OBHx-Prior Fetal Death
Closest Relative	OBHx->2 Abortions
Address 1	OBHx-Incompetent Cervix
Address 2	OBHx-Cervical Anomaly
City	OBHx-C-Section or VBACS
State	OBHx-Eclampsia
Zip Code	OBHx-IUGR
Education	OBHx-Infant > 9 lbs
Employment Status	OBHx-<1 Yr Since Last Birth
Directions to Home	OBHx-Infant Congenital Anomaly
Referral Date	OBHx-Infant CA Specify
Referral Source	OBHx-Gestational Diabetes
Initial Contact Date	OBHx-Prior LBW
Gravida	OBHx-Other OB History
Para	CP-Age-T1
Live	CP-Age-T2
AB	CP-Age-T3
LMP	CP-MP-T1
EDC	CP-MP-T2
Prenatal Care Provider	CP-MP-T3
Care Coordinator	CP-GestDiab-T1
Gest Age – 1	CP-GestDiab-T2
Med Score 1	CP-GestDiab-T3
Psycho-Social Score 1	CP-PIH-T1
Assess Complete – 1	CP-PIH-T2

Gest Age – 2	CP-PIH-T3
Med Score 2	CP-ThreatPTL-T1
Psycho-Social Score 2	CP-ThreatPTL-T2
Assess Complete - 2	CP-ThreatPTL-T3
Assess Due - 2	CP-Nutr-T1
Gest Age – 3	CP-Nutr-T2
Med Score 3	CP-Nutr-T3
Psycho-Social Score 3	CP-Polyhydramnios-T1
Assess Complete - 3	CP-Polyhydramnios-T2
Assess Due - 3	CP-Polyhydramnios-T3
Delivery Date	CP-PP-T1
Infant Name	CP-PP-T2
Sex	CP-PP-T3
Gestational Age	CP-VagBleed-T1
Birthweight	CP-VagBleed-T2
Discharge Feeding	CP-VagBleed-T3
Primary Care Provider	CP-UTI-T1
Transferred to NICU	CP-UTI-T2
Infant ER Visits	CP-UTI-T3
Imm/Check-Up Current	CP-Anemia-T1
Referral Close Date	CP-Anemia-T2
Referral Close Reason	CP-Anemia-T3
Direct Contacts Home	CP-HIV-T1
Direct Contacts Office	CP-HIV-T2
Indirect Contacts	CP-HIV-T3
Phone Contacts	CP-HepBC-T1
Attempts to Contact	CP-HepBC-T2
Prev Terminations	CP-HepBC-T3
Prev Deliveries	CP-STC-T1
Prev Birthweights Average	CP-STC-T2
Prev High Risk Pregs	CP-STC-T3
Prev Delivery Complications	CP-TB-T1
Type of Last Delivery	CP-TB-T2
Non-Emergent Perinatal Visits	CP-TB-T3
Perinatal ER Visits	CP-RHSens-T1
Level II Ultrasounds	CP-RHSens-T2
Perinatologist Visits	CP-RHSens-T3
Length of Subsequent Preg Spacing	CP-SizeDate-T1
Birth Control Method	CP-SizeDate-T2
M&M Patient Nbr	CP-SizeDate-T3
Uterine Surgery	CP-StrepB-T1
Biopsies	CP-StrepB-T2
D&Cs	CP-StrepB-T3
Leep	CP-AbnGeneticTest-T1
Conization	CP-AbnGeneticTest-T2
Cryos	CP-AbnGeneticTest-T3

Abn Pap Smear	CP-1stPrenatalVisit
STDs	CP-PROM-T1
BC Methods/Complications	CP-PROM-T2
First Menses	CP-PROM-T3
First Sexual Encounter	CP-Other-T1
Nbr of Sex Partners	CP-Other-T2
Nbr of New Partners	CP-Other-T3
BC Method at Discharge	ES-Ed-T1
MC-None	ES-Ed-T2
MC-Febrile	ES-Ed-T3
MC-Meconium	ES-WorkSchoolCond-T1
MC-PROM	ES-WorkSchoolCond-T2
MC-Abruption	ES-WorkSchoolCond-T3
MC-Previa	ES-LivingCond-T1
MC-Hemorrhage	ES-LivingCond-T2
MC-Seizures	ES-LivingCond-T3
MC-Precipitos	ES-Financial-T1
MC-Prolonged	ES-Financial-T2
MC-DysLabor	ES-Financial-T3
MC-Breech	ES-Food-T1
MC-CPD	ES-Food-T2
MC-CordProlapse	ES-Food-T3
MC-AnsComp	ES-Transportation-T1
MC-FetalDistress	ES-Transportation-T2
MC-Anemia	ES-Transportation-T3
MC-Infection	ES-ChildCare-T1
MC-LaborTrauma	ES-ChildCare-T2
MC-PPROM	ES-ChildCare-T3
MC-Other	SS-SocSupport-T1
Date Created	SS-SocSupport-T2
Date Updated	SS-SocSupport-T3
Date Reported	SS-Legal-T1
	SS-Legal-T2
BIRTH FILE	SS-Legal-T3
Patient Id	SS-CurrAbuse-T1
Seq	SS-CurrAbuse-T2
Delivery Date	SS-CurrAbuse-T3
Infant Name	SS-HxAbuse-T1
Sex	SS-HxAbuse-T2
Gestational Age	SS-HxAbuse-T3
BW Pounds	SS-FamSpecNeeds-T1
BW Oz	SS-FamSpecNeeds-T2
Birthweight	SS-FamSpecNeeds-T3
Delivery Type	PS-MH-T1
Discharge Feeding	PS-MH-T2
PHP Discharge Feeding	PS-MH-T3

Primary Care Provider	PS-Feelings-T1
Transferred to NICU	PS-Feelings-T2
Infant ER Visits	PS-Feelings-T3
Imm/Check-Up Current	PS-PregIntend
PHP Discharge Imm Current	KE-PhysioEmotChanges-T1
Date Deceased	KE-PhysioEmotChanges-T2
NC-None	KE-PhysioEmotChanges-T3
NC-Anemia	KE-Parenting-T1
NC-Injury	KE-Parenting-T2
NC-FAS	KE-Parenting-T3
NC-HASpir	KE-SeekingServ-T1
NC-MASpir	KE-SeekingServ-T2
NC-AsstVent	KE-SeekingServ-T3
NC-Seizures	KE-HealthMaint-T1
NC-CA	KE-HealthMaint-T2
NC-Jaundice	KE-HealthMaint-T3
NC-LTInfect	SU-OTC-Past
NC-W/D	SU-OTC-T1
NC-AbBloodSugar	SU-OTC-T2
NC-Death	SU-OTC-T3
NC-Other	SU-Caffeine-Past
	SU-Caffeine-T1
<u>REFERRING DIAGNOSIS FILE</u>	SU-Caffeine-T2
Referring Dx Id	SU-Caffeine-T3
Patient Id	SU-Tobacco-Past
Diagnosis	SU-Tobacco-T1
	SU-Tobacco-T2
<u>PREGNANCY HISTORY FILE</u>	SU-Tobacco-T3
Preg Hx Id	SU-SHS-Past
Patient Id	SU-SHS-T1
Date Pregnancy Ended	SU-SHS-T2
Delivery Type	SU-SHS-T3
Weeks Gestation	SU-Alcohol-Past
Weight	SU-Alcohol-T1
Outcome	SU-Alcohol-T2
	SU-Alcohol-T3
	SU-Marijuana-Past
	SU-Marijuana-T1
	SU-Marijuana-T2
	SU-Marijuana-T3
	SU-Meth-Past
	SU-Meth-T1
	SU-Meth-T2
	SU-Meth-T3
	SU-Cocaine-Past
	SU-Cocaine-T1

	SU-Cocaine-T2
	SU-Cocaine-T3
	SU-Heroin-Past
	SU-Heroin-T1
	SU-Heroin-T2
	SU-Heroin-T3
	SU-Other-Past
	SU-Other-T1
	SU-Other-T2
	SU-Other-T3
	SU-Sig-Past
	SU-Sig-T1
	SU-Sig-T2
	SU-Sig-T3