

Chlamydia Screening Coverage Assessment: Preliminary Findings

Region IV Infertility Prevention Project
Advisory Board Meeting
October 8-9, 2009 • Charleston, SC

Kelly Morrison Opdyke, MPH
Sr. Program Associate
Cicatelli Associates Inc.

Background

Among females aged 15-24 years in Family Planning

- CT positivity is high (9.7% in Region IV, CY2008)
- Estimated screening coverage hovers around 50%

Region IV	Age Group (in Years)	# Females Tested	# Females Eligible†	Estimated Screening Coverage (%)
CY 2008	15-19	114,051	229,167	49.8%
	20-24	165,993	308,399	53.8%
	>24	202,586	441,916	45.8%
	TOTAL	482,630	979,482	49.3%

Source: Family Planning Annual Report (FPAR) Tables 1 & 11.

† Based on number of unique users.

Background (cont'd)

- Change in ACOG Pap guidelines for adolescents (2005)
 - 3 years after first sexual intercourse, or by age 21
- All states have access to urine specimens
 - Some already using widely in Family Planning
 - High positivity observed among pregnancy test only clients
- Several states have already revised screening criteria to include urine screening for young women who do not need a Pap.
 - Additional training on revised guidelines?

Assessment of Gaps in Screening Coverage

- **Purpose**

- Establish baseline data describing female family planning users who were and were not tested for chlamydia
- Identify gaps and opportunities to increase screening coverage among females <26 years of age
- Part of a coordinated effort by the National IPP across all 10 Public Health Service regions

Assessment of Gaps in Screening Coverage (cont'd)

- **Two levels of analysis**
 - Title X grantee (statewide)
 - For facilities in areas targeted for GC action plan

Data Requested for Analysis

Tables:

1. Characteristics of users tested and not tested for chlamydia by age, race, ethnicity
2. Number of service visits by age group
3. Proportion of users tested for chlamydia by visit type
4. Chlamydia positivity by age and visit type

Data Requested for Analysis (cont'd)

Also requested description of:

- Challenges related to data collection
- Current screening criteria
- Possible/current strategies to increase screening coverage among females aged 15-24 years
- Barriers to increasing testing among users that do not receive a pelvic exam
- Possible steps to overcome barriers

Possible Data Sources

- Family Planning Annual Report (FPAR)
 - Unduplicated users by age group
 - Number users tested for chlamydia by age group
 - Ratio used to estimate screening coverage
- Title X administrative and/or billing data
- Laboratory data (for test results)
- IPP data (to evaluate positivity, and current utilization of urine for specimen collection)

Assumptions

- Most variables requested are already collected for Family Planning Annual Report (FPAR)
- Client visit record (CVR) or encounter form includes demographic variables (age, race, ethnicity) and service data (Pap, CBE, chlamydia test, pregnancy test, etc.) that can be linked to individuals
- Laboratory test results may be linked with client-level data where a chlamydia test was performed

Preliminary Findings

Estimated Screening Coverage among Female FP Users, CY2008

State	Visit Type	15-19 yrs of age	20-24 yrs of age
TN	All Visits	52% (15,679/30,156)	49% (17,796/36,368)
	Initial/Annual	46% (5,748/12,631)	37% (5,675/15,485)
	Pregnancy Test Only (PTO)	57% (6,846/11,966)	56% (8,703/15,446)
	Other services	55% (3,085/5,559)	63% (3,418/5,437)

Data source: TN Department of Health (PP Nashville, PP Memphis not available)

Preliminary Findings

Chlamydia Positivity among Female FP Users, CY2008

State	Visit Type	15-19 yrs of age	20-24 yrs of age
TN	All Visits	8.4% (1,321/15,679)	6.2% (1,104/17,796)
	Initial/Annual	7.0% (402/5,748)	5.1% (291/5,675)
	Pregnancy Test Only (PTO)	9.2% (628/6,846)	7.1% (622/8,703)
	Other services	9.4% (291/3,085)	5.6% (191/3,418)

Data source: TN Department of Health (PP Nashville, PP Memphis not available)

Preliminary Findings

Estimated Screening Coverage among Female FP Users, CY2008

State	Visit Type	15-19 yrs of age	20-24 yrs of age
NC	All Visits	55.2% (16,130/29,217)	75.3% (21,932/29,143)
	Initial/Annual	49.3% (14,396/29,217)	66.2% (19,294/29,143)
	Pregnancy Test Only (PTO)	<i>Not reported</i>	<i>Not reported</i>
	Other services*	<i>Not reported</i>	<i>Not reported</i>

*Includes “volunteer/medical problem, sex partner referral, and other/unknown”.

Data source: NC DHHS (Durham, Forsyth, Guilford, Mecklenburg, & Wake not avail.)

Preliminary Findings

Chlamydia Positivity among Female FP Users, CY2008

State	Visit Type	15-19 yrs of age	20-24 yrs of age
NC	All Visits	10.0% (1,611/16,130)	6.2% (1,358/21,932)
	Initial/Annual	10.0% (1,440/14,396)	6.1% (1,182/19,294)
	Pregnancy Test Only (PTO)	<i>Not reported</i>	<i>Not reported</i>
	Other services*	9.9% (171/1,734)	6.7% (176/2,638)

*Includes “volunteer/medical problem, sex partner referral, and other/unknown”.

Data source: NC DHHS (Durham, Forsyth, Guilford, Mecklenburg, & Wake not avail.)

Preliminary Findings

- States examined data sources that can be used to measure and monitor screening coverage
- Facilitated collaboration between FP and STD partners related to using data to inform program
- In some cases, states were able to establish baseline estimates of screening coverage and positivity by visit type that will help identify changes resulting from
 - Increased use of urine specimens
 - Expanded screening criteria

Summary of Reported Challenges

- Data for some providers (i.e. data not maintained directly by the state/county) more difficult to access
 - Data for target areas not always available
- Unable to report on unduplicated users for each measure (especially visit type, CT test, CT result).
- No standard definitions for visit types (other than initial and annual) across grantees.
- Often difficult to distinguish “pregnancy testing only” clients from clients receiving other services.

Summary of Reported Challenges (cont'd)

- Data are not routinely collected in all states by visit type and age, or whether a chlamydia test was performed at the time of each visit.
- Limited staff resources to extract data in the requested format.
- Data not always comparable to FPAR estimate of screening coverage.
- Various data sources (FPAR, administrative/billing, lab data, IPP) difficult to link.

Experiences of State FP Partners

- What data sources were available to help respond to this assessment?
- Who did you work with to collect this information?
- What were the challenges?
- What did you find?
- What steps are you planning as a result?