Methods

OTA'S 1988 Survey of State Rural Health Activities

Survey Instrument and Respondents—A written questionnaire was designed to assess State involvement in rural health programs and activities (a copy of the questionnaire and a list of respondents' names and addresses follow the methods section in this appendix). A draft of the survey instrument was reviewed by selected individuals and by two of the eventual respondents, and it was subsequently revised in accordance with their comments.

Respondents for the survey were identified through brief telephone interviews with State health officers or other individuals known to be knowledgeable about rural health activities within that State. Multiple responses were received from 13 States where 2 or more organizationally independent entities were identified as playing a major role in State rural health planning, development, research, and/or policy (see ch. 4, figure 4-1). A total of 65 respondents reported for the 50 States.

The survey solicited basic descriptive information including the agency's specific rural health objectives, location in the State organizational structure, and origins (e.g., legislative or administrative).

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had been directly involved during the past 3 years in specific rural health *activities* within the following 8 general categories:

- 1. provider recruitment/placement;
- 2. financial assistance to local organizations;
- 3. technical assistance to rural communities, health facilities, and health providers;
- 4. rural health research;
- 5. rural health systems coordination and implementation;
- 6. education;

7. legislative affairs relating to rural health; and 8. rural health-related publications.

Respondents were then asked to identify, from the eight general *activity* categories, the three that were their organization's highest priorities for action, and to indicate any special populations (e.g., children, elderly, low income, racial/ethnic groups) to which their previously identified rural health activities were targeted. Respondents were asked to rank six general health *issue areas* (e.g., medical liability insurance costs/availability, payment issues, health provider issues) according to which were the most pressing *issues* for rural health in the State, with the option to add and rank any of their own priorities not listed. Respondents were also asked to rate on a six-point scale their level of involvement in several specific health services (e.g., acute health care, child health care, long-term care, mental health care). Due to inconsistencies in interpretation of and responses to this section¹, however, responses were not included in the analysis.

Data Collection and Analysis—Data were collected on the mailed survey form from all 50 States. After being received by OTA, the data were summarized on a standardized form and sent back to the respondent for verification. For States with more than one respondent, all respondents were sent both a copy of their response summary and the summaries from the other respondents in their State. The verified (or corrected) data were used for the analysis. Information about budget and staff size was also collected, but because these items were not addressed consistently budget and staff data were for the most part excluded from analysis. While specific budget data were not comparable, analysis of funding sources was conducted to examine the degrees of dependence of responding organizations on Federal, State, and private or other dollars. For this reason, only budget changes and sources are reported.

¹Followup phone conversations with respondents revealed that many thought this section of the survey meant to elicit responses regarding level of involvement in the *delivery* of these specific services, rather than involvement in research, planning, and development activities.

²Differences in State budgeting and recording procedures as well as differences in States' definitions of "rural" limited the amount and uniformity of financial data collected through the survey. Seven States did not respond to this section of the survey, and the remaining 43 used a variety of methods to determine the amount of their budget spent on rural health activities. Some respondents listed the entire Stathealth budget others computed the rural health budget as a percentage of the total State health budget according to the proportion of rural residents or rural counties in the State; and some States reported specific budget allocations for rural health initiatives.

Data from the States with more than one respondent were combined to reflect the total picture of State activities. For items requiring a single response (i.e., priorities, rankings, and ratings), a primary respondent was selected by the OTA staff based on their judgment regarding which respondent appeared most generally knowledgeable about the breadth of the State's activities.

For purposes of analyses, States were divided in three fashions. First, States were divided into four standard regions: Northeast, South, Midwest, and West (see app. F for the States included in each region). Second, States were classified as "more rural" or "less rural" depending on the percentage of their population residing in nonmetropolitan areas in 1986.³Third, States were divided according to whether the respondents in that State were reporting activities of an identified "office of rural health," or an office whose primary responsibility is to administer to the health needs of rural areas of the State.⁴

This survey does not provide a complete picture of State-conducted or State-funded rural healthrelated activities, but it does give us a basis for describing State activities. Respondents were often in specific bureaus, divisions, or sections of State departments of health, and did not always respond on behalf of the department or the State government as a whole. Rather, they tended to describe only the activities in which they were directly involved. Rural health-related activities of other State departments or agencies and independent activities of State universities and colleges (e.g., university-based offices of rural health or Area Health Education Centers) were for the most part not captured.⁵ Chapter 4 includes a list of the entities in each State whose activities were reported in the survey response. The survey also did not attempt to determine: 1) the degree to which the respondents or their agencies were involved in any given activity; 2) the degree to which any particular activity was deemed effective, either by the organization itself or by outside individuals; or 3) the amount or source of funding for any specific activity. These limitations may affect the comparability of data among States.

The degree to which individual States identified "ruralhealth' issues as separate from general health issues and addressed them in a targeted manner varied greatly from State to State. The survey did not prescribe a definition of "rural' correspondents, but left the definitional issue up to the individual States. What is considered "urban" in North Dakota may be considered "rural" in New Jersey or Pennsylvania. Some of the more urban States may not identify rural health as a specific issue because such a small proportion of their population is affected, while some of the more rural States may not regard 'rural health" as a separate set of issues because most of their population is rural. As a result, some of the activities listed by respondents were not specifically targeted to rural areas, but were provided to the State as a whole. These differences may also affect the comparability of State data.

OTA'S 1989 Survey of States on Health Personnel Shortage and Medically Underserved Areas

A second OTA survey was designed to examine State activity and satisfaction with the Federal designation of health manpower shortage areas (HMSAs) and medically underserved areas (MUAs). The questionnaire was reviewed by 10 people familiar with shortage area designations and was subsequently revised based on their comments (a copy of the questionnaire follows the methods section in this appendix). In July 1989 OTA mailed the questionnaire to the individual in each State responsible for designating health personnel shortages and medically underserved areas.⁶ Respondents were encouraged to consult with other involved parties in their States when responding to the

³"More _{rural}" States (the with more than 50 percent of their population residing in nonmetropolitan areas) are Idaho, Vermont, Men-South Dakota, Wyoming, Mississippi, Maine, West Virginia, North Dakota, Arkansas, Iowa, Alaska, Kentucky, Nebraska, and New Mexico. All other States are considered "less rural".

⁴A State was identified as having an office of rural health if a) the name of one or more of the responding organizations within that State included the term "rural", orb) the organization was otherwise known to have a mission primarily related to rural health. States with offices of rural health (hereafter referred to as "ORH States") were: Arizona, California, Connecticut Goergia, Nebraska, Nevada, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Texas, and Utah. All other States were classified as "non-ORH States." States with offices of "local" or "community" health were not classified as "ORH States," although the roles of these offices may be similar to the role of an office of rural health.

⁵In some States, AHECs operating Primarily on State funding and university-based offices of rural health with State budget authority were included if they had been identified as appropriate respondents during the identification process.

⁶The list of respondents was based in part on a list supplied by the Office of Shortage Designation, Bureau of Health Care Delivery and Assistance. Other respondents were identified through phone calls to State health department officials.

questionnaire. Forty-five of fifty States returned questionnaires—a 90 percent response rate.⁷ (No list of respondents to this survey is included in this appendix because some responses were confidential.)

The goals of OTA's survey were to learn:

- how satisfied States were with Federal designation criteria and processes;
- if and why interest in Federal designations had increased or decreased over the last 5 years;
- if States were using their own health personnel shortage areas or medically underserved area designations and, if so, how they were used;

- if States had sufficient resources to monitor health personnel shortage and medically undeserved areas; and
- what Federal programs were perceived to have had the most positive effects on shortage and underserved areas.

Data analysis included variable frequencies and some regional comparisons.

⁷California, Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts, and North Dakota did not return questio maires. Wyoming was also excluded from the Survey analysis because, as of June 1988, the position responsible for HMSA/MUA designations was cut and it has since been left to individual counties and hospitals to do their own designations.

List of Respondents to OTA's 1988 Survey of State Rural Health Activities

NOTE: The first respondent listed under each State was the "primary respondent", whose responses to the ranking and rating sections were used to express State rural health issues and priorities.

"*' indicates the entity whose activities are reported in the survey response. Budget data may not be reported for the same entity, but for a more specific division.

"**' indicates the person who completed the questionnaire.

Joan McConnell Director Planning and Program Development Bureau of Environment& Health Service Standards Dept. of Public Health 434 N. Monroe Street Room 249 Montgomery, AL 36130-1701 * Bureau of Environment & Health Service Standards ** Naomi Halverson Dwavne B. Peeples

Division of Public Health Dept. of Health& Social Services P.O. Box H-06 Juneau, AK 99801 * Division of Public Health, Dept. of Health and Social Services ** Dwayne B. Peeples

Alison M. Hughes Associate Director Rural Health Office University of Arizona 3131 East Second Street Tucson, AZ 85716 * Rural Health Office ** Alison M. Hughes

Charles McGrew Director Section of Health Facilities, Services& systems Arkansas Dept. of Health 4815 W. Markham Little Reek, AR 72205 * Section of Health Facilities, Services & systems ** Yvette Lamb, Director, Office of Primary care Charles Cranford Director Arkansas Area Health Education Center Program University of Arkansas for Medical Sciences 4301 W. Markham, Slot 599 Little Rock, AR 72205 * AR Area Health Education Center Program ** James L. McFadin, Associate Director,

Administration

William Avritt Chief Rural and Community Health Division Dept. of Health Services 714 P street Sacramento, CA 95814 * Rural and Community Health Division ** Lawrence J. McCabe, Jr., Chief, Hospital and Medical Standards Program

Margaret Gerould Deputy Director Division of Health Planning and Analysis Office of Statewide Health Planning& Development 1600 9th Street, Room 440 Sacramento, CA 95814 * Office of State Health Planning& Development ** Ernesto Iglesias, Manager, Small & Rural Hospital Project

Lindy Wallace Health Planning Consultant Colorado Dept. of Health 4210 E, 11th Avenue Denver, CO 80220 * State of Colorado ** Lindy Wallace

Susette Benn Center for Chronic Diseases/Urban/Rural Health 150 Washington Street Hartford, CT 06106 * State of Connecticut ** Susette Benn

Richard Steiman Deputy Director Division of Public Health Cooper Bldg, P.O. Box 637 Dover, DE 19903 * Division of Public Health ** Marihelen Barrett, MCH Director

Gregory Glass Administrator Florida Health Manpower Program 1317 Winewood Boulevard Tallahassee, FL 32399-0700 * State of Florida ** Gregory Glass Raymond Seabolt Director Primary Health Care Section Room 100 878 Peachtree Street, N.E. Atlanta, GA 30309 * Primary Health Care Section ** Rita C. Salain, Community Health Specialist David Foulk Director Center for Rural Health Georgia Southern College L.B. #8148

Statesboro, GA 30460 * Center for Rural Health, Georgia

Southern College ** David Foulk

Peter Sybinsky Deputy Director for Planning, Legislation and Operations Hawaii Dept. of Health P.O. Box 3378 Honolulu, HI 96801 * Dept. of Health ** Peter Sybinsky

Diane Bowen Supervisor Office of Health Policy& Resource Development Division of Health Dept. of Health& Welfare 450 W. State Street, 4th Floor Boise, ID 83720 * State of Idaho ** Diane Bowen

Alvin B. Grant Acting Director Center for Rural Health Illinois Dept. of Public Health 535 West Jefferson Springfield, IL 62761 * State of Illinois ** Alvin B. Grant

Keith Main Director Public Health Research Division Indiana State Board of Health 1330 West Michigan Street P.O. Box 1964 Indianapolis, IN 46206-1964 * State of Indiana ** Keith Main

Mary Ellis Director Dept. of Public Health Lucas State Office Building Des Moines, IA 50319-0075 * State of Iowa ** Louise Lex, State Health Planner Steve McDowell Director Office of Rural Health Dept. of Health and Environment Landon State Office Building, 10th Floor 900 SW Jackson Topeka, KS 66612-1290 * State of Kansas ** Steve McDowell

Don Coffey Manager Health Resources Development Branch Division for Health Policy & Resource Development Dept. of Health Services 275 East Main Street Frankfort, KY 40621 * State of Kentucky ** Don Coffey

Patrick O'Connor Director Division of Policy& Program Development Dept. of Health& Hospitals 655 N. 5th Street, Suite 307 Baton Rouge, LA 70802 * State of Louisiana ** Marcia L. Daigle, Director, Primary Care Coordinating Unit

Sophie Glidden Office of Health Planning and Development 151 Capitol Street, Station 11 Augusta, ME 04333 * State of Maine ** Sophie Glidden

Jeanette Washington Health Planner Maryland Health Resources Planning Commission P.O. Box 2679 Baltimore, MD 21215-2299 301/764-3323 * MD Health Resource Planning Commission ** Jeanette Washington Jonathan Foley Maryland Dept. of Health& Mental Hygiene 201 W. Preston St., RM 314-B Baltimore, MD 21201 * Primary Care Cooperative Agreement Dept. of Health and Mental Hygiene ** Jonathan Foley Susan Bernstein Director Office of Local and Regional Health Massachusetts Dept. of Public Health **150 Tremont Street** Boston, MA 02111 * Dept. of Public Health ** Susan Bernstein & Hillel Liebert, **District Health Officer, Western** Massachusetts Lou Crosby **Policy Chief Division of Health Facility Planning**& **Policy Development Bureau of Health Facilities** Michigan Dept. of Public Health P.O. Box 30195 Lansing, MI 48909 * Division of Health Facility Planning & * **Policy Development** ** Lou Crosby

Jim Parker Director Community Health Services Division Dept. of Health 717 Delaware St., S.E. Minneapolis, MN 55440 * Dept. of Health ** Wayne R. Carlson, Director, Community Development

Ella Tardy Director Office of Primary Care Liaison Mississippi State Dept. of Health P.O. Box 1700 Jackson, MS 39215-1700 * Office of Primary Care Liaison ** Ella Tardy Lorna Wilson

Lorna Wilson Director Division of Local Health & Institutional Services Dept. of Health P.O. Box 570 Jefferson City, MO 65102-0570 * Bureau of Primary Care, Division of Local Health& Institutional Services ** George A Thomas, Jr. program Coordinator, Bureau of Primary Care Thomas R. Piper Director Certificate of Need Program Dept. of Health P.O. Box 570 Jefferson City, MO 65102 * Certificate of Need Program ** Thomas R. Piper

Charles Aegenes Chief Health Planning Bureau Dept. of Health&Environmental Sciences Cogswell Building, Capitol Station Helena, MT 59620 * Bureau of Health Planning ** Charles Aegenes

David Palm Director Nebraska Office of Rural Health Dept. of Health P.O. Box 95007 Lincoln, NE 68509 * State of Nebraska ** David Palm

Joseph Jarvis State Health Officer Division of Health Nevada Dept. of Human Resources 505 E King Street Carson City, NV 89710 * Division of Health ** Ron Lange, Administrative Health Services Officer

Caroline Ford Director Office of Rural Health University of Nevada Mackay Science, Rm. 201 Reno, NV 89557-0046 * Nevada Office of Rural Health ** Caroline Ford

William T. Wallace, Jr. Director New Hampshire Division of Public Health Services 6 Hazen Drive Concord, NH 03301 * Division of Public Health Services ** John D. Bonds, Assistant Director for Planning Viktoria K. Wood **Research Scientist** New Jersey Dept. of Health Local Health Development Services **379 West State Street** Trenton, NJ 08625 * State of New Jersey ** Viktoria K. Wood

Harvey Licht program Manager Primary Care Section Dept. of Health& Environment P.O. Box %8 Santa Fe, NM 87501-0968 * Primary Care Section ** Harvey Licht

Charles Alfero Director New Mexico Health Resources, Inc. P.O. Box 27650 Albuquerque, NM 87125 * New Mexico Health Resources, Inc. ** Charles Alfero

Paul Fitzpatrick New York State Dept. of Health Division of Planning, Policy, and Resource Development Empire State Plaza Corning Tower—Room 1656 Albany, NY 12237 * State of New York ** Assistant Chief Health Planner

James D. Bernstein Chief North Carolina Office of Health Resources Development 701 Barbour Drive Raleigh, NC 27603 * Office of Health Resources Development ** James D. Bernstein

Eugene S. Mayer Program Director North Carolina AHEC program CB #7165 Medical School Wing C University of North Carolina/Chapel Hill Chapel Hill, NC 27599 * North Carolina AHEC Program ** Eugene S. Mayer

Robert M. Wentz North Dakota State Dept. of Health& Consolidated Laboratories Judicial Wing 2nd Fl 600 E. Boulevard Ave Bismarck, ND 58505-0200 * State Dept. of Health ** Robert M. Wentz

Jack Geller Acting Director The Center for Rural Health Services, Policy & Research University of North Dakota 501 Columbia Road Grand Forks, ND 58201 * Center for Rural Health Services, Policy & Research ** Lynett Krenelka, Grants Coordinator Susan Ewing-Ramsay Head Primary Care Section Ohio Dept. of Health 246 N. High Street Columbus, OH 43266-0118 * Primary Care Section ** Susan Ewing Ramsay

SUZANNE Nichols Director Oklahoma Health Planning Commission Dept. of Health 1000 NE 10th St. Oklahoma City, OK 73152 * Oklahoma Health Planning Commission ** Howard H. Vincent

Don K. Leavitt Executive Director Oklahoma Physician Manpower Training Commission P.O. Box 53551, Rm. 211 1000 NE 10th St. Oklahoma City, OK 73152 * Physician Manpower Training Commission

** Don K. Leavitt

Brent VanMeter Deputy comissioner for Special Health Services Dept. of Health P.O. Box 53551 1000 NE 10th St. Oklahoma City, OK 73152 * State Dept. of Health ** Brent VanMeter

Marsha R. Kilgore Manager State of Oregon Office of Rural Health 1174 Chemeketa St. NE Salem, OR 97301 * State of Oregon ** Marsha R. Kilgore

Stephen Male Director Bureau of Health Financing& Program Development Pennsylvania Dept. of Health P.O. Box 90 Harrisburg, PA 17120 * Bureau of Health Financing & Program Development ** Stephen Male

William White Division of Hospitals Pennsylvania Dept. of Health P.O. Box 90 Harrisburg, PA 17120 * Division of Hospitals ** William White

Sharon K. Cagen
Project Director
Cooperative Agreement for Primary Care services
Rhode Island Dept. of Health
75 Davis Street
Providence, RI 02908
* State of Rhode Island
** Sharon K. Cagen

Thomas McGee Director office of Primary care Dept. of Health and Environmental Control 2600 Bull Street Columbia, SC 29201 * office of Primary care ** Tom McGee

Bernie Osberg Rural Health Manager South Dakota Office of Rural Health Dept. of Health 523 E Capitol Pierre, SD 57501 * Dept. of Health ** Bernie Osberg

Scot Graff Manager Rural Health Program University of South Dakota School of Medicine 2501 W. 22nd Street Sioux Falls, SD 57117-5346 * University of South Dakota School of Medicine ** Scot Graff

Eloise Hatmaker Division of Health Access 100 9th Avenue North Nashville, TN 37219 * State of Tennessee ** Ray Davis, Director of Physician Placement, & Annette Menees, Health Planner

Albert Randall Associate Commissioner for Community & Rural Health Dept. of Health 1100 w 49th street Austin, TX 78756 * Dept. of Health ** John Dombroski Director, Primary Health Care Services program Ellen Widess Director of Rural Health

Dept. of Agriculture

P.O. Box 12847 Austin, TX 78711 * Dept. of Agriculture ** Ellen Widess

Claudia Siegel Director of Medical Programs Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board P.O. Box 12788 Austin, TX 78711 * Higher Education Coordinating Board ** Claudia Siegel

Robert W. Sherwood, Jr. Director Bureau of Local and Rural Health Systems Utah Dept. of Health 288 North 1460 West, P.O. Box 16660 Salt Lake City, UT 84116-0660 * State of Utah ** Robert W. Sherwood, Jr.

Christine Finley Health Planner Vermont Dept. of Health 60 Main Street-Box 70 Burlington, VT 05402 * State of Vermont ** Christine Finley Raymond O. Perry Director Office of Planning and Regulatory Services Division of Health Planning Dept. of Health 1010 James Madison Building 109 Governor Street Richmond, VA 23219 * State of Virginia ** Raymond O. perry

Verne Gibbs Health Planning Administrator Dept. of Health Mailstop OB-43F Olympia, WA 98504 * Dept. of Health ** Verne Gibbs

George W. Lilley, Jr. Acting Administrator Division of Health 1800 Washington Street, East Building 3, RM 206 Charleston, WV 25305 * Dept. of Health ** George W. *Lilley*, Jr.

Richard C. Heinz Coordinator Primary **Care** Programs Division of Health P.O. Box 1808 Madison, WI 53701-1808 * State of Wisconsin ** Richard C. Heinz

R.L. Meuli Director State of Wyoming Health Dept. Cheyenne, WY 82002 * Wyoming Health Dept.

** Larry Goodmay

SURVEY OF STATE RURAL HEALTH ACTIVITIES

Spring 1988

Office of Technology Assessment U.S. Congress Washington, D.C. 20510-8025

Conducted by the Office of Technology Assessment U.S. Congress

1. GENERAL DESCRIPTION

SURVEY OF STATE RURAL H

- READ OVER THE SURVEY CAREFULLY. If you have any questions, contact Leah Wolfe or Marc Zimmerman at the Office of Technology Assessment, Health Program, U.S. Congress, Washington, D.C. 20510-8025 (202/228-6590).
- 2. Please feel free to attach separate sheets whenever more room is needed for a response.
- Please note that for each item in the ACTIVITIES section, we are interested only in activities your organization is CURRENTLY involved in OR has been involved in DURING THE PAST 3 YEARS.
- 4. Please make use of the "other" categories throughout the survey to capture any activities/programs that we have not included in our checklists. Don't forget to <u>describe</u> these other activities in the spaces provided.
- 5. Please enclose any representative literature/publications you may have that will help describe your activities/programs in greater detail, and feel free to reference this literature at any point in the survey (e.g., "See p. 26 of enclosed Annual Report for description of our demonstration projects."). A postage-paid envelope has been provided for this purpose.
- 6. When you have finished, please enclose the completed questionnaire as well as any related literature in the postage-paid envelope. Please return the survey by

***************************************	==

Address:	
Phone:	
Name/Title of director:	
Name/Title of. other key contact:	
Name/Title of persots completing survey :	
Year established	
Type of organization:	<u>State</u> Government-based
	<u>Unive</u> rsity-based
	<u>Private/non-profit</u>
	Other (describe)
fling and Funding	
	are only part of your organization's responsibilities,
f rural health activities	s are only part of your organization's responsibilities, stimates based on those activities alone.)
f rural health activities use make the following e	stimates based on those activities alone.)
f rural health activities use make the following e	
f <i>rural health</i> activities ase make the following e Number of people on sta	stimates based on those activities alone.)
f rural health activities use make the following e Number of people on sta Fotal annual budget for	stimates based on those activities alone.) If: FTE (include professional, administrative, support) rural programs (include federal, state, local, private, and
f rural health activities use make the following e Number of people on sta Fotal annual budget for	stimates based on those activities alone.) ff: FTE (include professional, administrative, support) rural programs (include federal, state, local, private, and FY 87: s
f rural health activities use make the following e Number of people on sta Fotal annual budget for	stimates based on those activities alone.) ff: FTE (include professional, administrative, support) rural programs (include federal, state, local, private, and

Breakdown: <u>% Fe</u>deral funding —% Local public funding _____% State funding —% Fee-for-service income <u>% Private funding (e.g., foundation grants)</u>

Please list private funding sources

1

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION<

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

A) What are your organization's rural health objectives? (Include your official mandate, if applicable.):	Please check those rural health activities below in which your organization has been DIRECTLY involved DURING THE PAST 3 YEARS. If your organization engages in/has engaged in any activities that are not listed here, please check "other" and describe these activities in the space provided.
	A: PROVIDER RECRUITMENT/PLACEMENT
	NO, we have not done any provider recruitment or placement in the past 3 years. If NO, are there any other agencies/organizations in your State that do? Please give names:
	YES, we engage/have engaged in the activities indicated below:
B) Was your organization established on the authority of State legislation or through an	Indicate of projects PLACED OVER. THE PAST 3 YEARS: (please put \bullet 0" if you recruited but did not place anyone)
administrative action?	M. D.'s/D.O.'s Physician Assistants
	R.N.'s Mental Health Professionals
	— Nurse Practitioners
	• Other (Please specify typea and give * PLACED OVER THE PAST 3 YEARS - e.g., L. P. N.'s, Physicat Therapists, Pharmacists):
	Recruitment methods (check all that apply
	— Loan forgiveness/repayment programs (Please describe):
	 — State scholarships in exchange for service in rural areas
C) Where within the organizational structure of the State government are you located? (Please provide an organizational chart if available.) If you are not a State agency, what is your	— Other financial incentives
relationship to the State government?	Placement service
	Other
PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE	E PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE 3

1. GENERAL DESCRIPTION (CONTINUED)

A) What are your organization's rural health objectives? (Include your official mandate, if

2. ACTIVITIES

2. ACTIVITIES (CONTINUED)

B: FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS

NO, we have not provided any financial assistance during the past 3 years. if NO, are there any other agencies/organizations in your State that do? Please give names:

YES, we have provided/provide the types of financial assistance checked below:

Type of assistance:	Recipient (e.g., rural communities, local organizations, educational institutions)
Loans (non-student)	
Direct subsidy	
Matching funds	
— Other (describe)	

C: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

NO, we have not provided any technical assistance during the past 3 years. If NO, are there I nj other agencies/organizations in your State that do? Please give **names**:

4

- YES, we have provided/provide the types of technical assistance checked below.

(1) _____ HMSA/MUA/MUP designations

(2) Assistance to rural communities

Statewide Mental health needs assessment

Date of last Statewide assessment

- Other needs assessments (describe)

- Community Board development
- Grant application assistance
- _____ planning
- -Resource identification
- ---- Other: _____

2. ACTIVITIES, C: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE (CONTINUED)

(3) Assistance to rural health facilities/providers

- Facility development/construction consultation
- Grant application assistance
 Management assistance
- Other _____

D: RESEARCH

NO, we have not done any rural health research in the past 3 years. 11 NO, are there • ny other agencies/organizations in your State that do? Please give names:

YES, we have done/are doing research on the following topics (check all that apply):

Health personnel
Health services utiliza
Health status (e.g., mo
Health systems coordin
Insurance coverage in
Medical liability insur
New technology (e.g.,
Quality of care
Rural hospitals
Other:

5

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE.

2. ACTIVITIES (CONTINUED)

E: RURAL HEALTH SYSTEMS COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

NO, we have not engaged in any rural health systems coordination or implementation during the past 3 years. If NO, are there any other agencies/organizations in your State that do?

Please give names:

YES, we have engaged/engage in the activities checked below:

Developing alliances between hospitals

Please specify types of participants (e.g., urban/rural, large/small)

<u>—</u> Developing alliances between hospitals and other medical service facilities (e.g., <u>WITH</u> CHC's, private physicians, mental health centers, county health depts.)

Please specify types of participants:

 $Developing alliances \ \underline{not} involving hospitals (e.g., \ \underline{AMONG} \ CHC's, \ private \ physicians, mental health centers, county health depts., community representatives)$

Please specify types of participants:

_

:	Special	health se	ervice	district	development	or o	ther	financial	options
	Please	describe:	~						
(Other:								

F: EDUCATION
_____NO, we have not engaged in any educational activities during the past 3 year
If NO, are there any other agencies/organizations in your State that do?

YES,	we have engaged/engage in the educatio	nal activities checked below:

6

_____ Medical and other health professions education

____ Consumer health education programs

____ Continuing education programs for rural providers

____ Statewide rural health conferences

____ Other:

Please give names:

2. ACTIVITIES (CONTINUED)

G: LEG ISLATIVE AFFAIRS

NO, we have not engaged in any legislativeaffairs during the past 3 years If NO, are there any other agencies/organizations in your State that do? Please give names:

YES, we have engaged/engage in the activities checked below:

Development of task force/committee to address rural health care issues Working with legislature/legislative committees on rural health issues

____ Other: ____

H: PUBLICATIONS

Please check below any rural health-related publications your organization has produced during the past three years. Enclose representative samples if possible.

Annual report	Information packets	Research reports
Newsletter	Evaluation reports	 Newspaper articles
Journal articles —	- Policy recommendations	
Other		

I: PRIORITIES

Please check bdow UP TO THREE activity areas which are currently your higheat priorities

- _ A: PROVIDER RECRUITMENT/PLACEMENT F: EDUCATION
- _ B: FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE TO LOCAL ORGANIZATIONS G: LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS
- C: TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE
- _ D: RESEARCH
- _ E: RURAL HEALTH SYSTEMS COORDINATION AND IMPLEMENTATION

3. SPECIAL POPULATIONS

Please	check below special populations to which any of your programs or activities
you indicated	• bove are/have been specifically targeted

7

Children	Racial/Ethnic	groups

- Please specify:
- Low income

Elderly

- Migrant workera Uninsured
- Pregnant women Other:

PLEASE CONT

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

- H: PUBLICATIONS

4. MAJOR RURAL HEALTH CARE DELIV	VERY ISSUES IN YOUR STATE *	5. QUESTIONS .=== as-=== ====.=.=.====*=*=-==*=-=
rank each of the six issues by severity of problem area, "6" the smallest problem a	list of health care DELIVERY issues in rural areas. Please the issue in your State, using *1 * to indicate the biggest area. List and rank any other health care DELIVERY issues inking scale as necessary. Please use each number only	Please describe briefly (A) three <u>CURRENT</u> activities and programs in your State that have been effective in addressing rural health issues; and B) three activities or programs you would like to see in your State IN THE FUTURE to address these issues. A) Current Activities (3):
Health provider issues (e.	.g., shortages, recruitment/retention)	
Please specify:		
Medical liability insuranc	ce costs/availability	
Meeting the needs of spechigh-risk pregnancies)	cial populations (e.g., elderly, migrant workers,	
Payment issues (e.g., Med	licare urban/rural differential, insurance coverage)	
Quality of care		
services issues (e.g., hosp development	pital closures & restructuring, systems planning &	
Other:		B) Future Activities (3):
SPECIFIC SERVICES Using the scale descri organization is CURRENTLY devoting to	bed below please indicate the amount of ● ttention your each of the following	
RATING SCALE: 0] devoting NO attention to this		
(You may use each number more than once .)	
Acute health Care	<u>Hom</u> e health care	
<u>Child</u> health care	<u>Long</u> term care	
Emergency medical care	<u>Mentai</u> health care	
Health promotion/Disease	obstetrics care	
reath promotion/Disease		
prevention	Other:	

PLEASE CONTINUE ON NEXT PAGE

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME AND COOPERATION.

Please return survey by ______ to: Leah Wolfe, Health Program, Office of Technology Assessment, U.S. Congress, Washington, DC 20510-8025.

July 24, 1989

CONGRESSIONAL OFFICE OF TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT'S SURVEY OF STATES ON HEALTH PERSONNEL SHORTAGE AND MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED AKEA DESIGNATIONS

Name/Title of completing s	person rvey:
Name/Title of contact(a):	other
Organization	
Phone:	

A. Primary Care Health Personnel Shortage Area Designations

- How satisfied are you with the criteria used to Hesilegnade <u>Primary</u> <u>Care Health Manpor</u> <u>orhortage Areas</u> (1MSAs)?
 - Very satisfied ______Satisfied ______Dissatisfied ______Very dissatisfied ______Don't know ______No opinion

Please describe why you satisfied odissatisfied.

a. What changes would you suggest in <u>Primary Care HNSA</u> criteria that would inprove identification of primary care personnel shortage areas?

- c. Describe any problems that you have had in designating primary care personnel shortage areas in the rural (i.e., nonmetropolitan)areas of your State (e.g. designations in frontier areas).
- 2 To what extent do you agree with the following statements:
 - a. A primary care HMSA's priority grouping (i.e., group 1-4) is a go measure of the HMSA's relative degree of primary care health personnel shortage.
 - _____Strongly agree <u>A g r</u> e e _____Disagree <u>Stro</u>ngly disagree <u>Don'</u>t know <u>No__</u>opinion

Comment:	Co	mm	en	t	:
----------	----	----	----	---	---

b. Allocation of Federal resources is correlated to HMSA priority groups.

_____Strongly agree Agree Disagree <u>Strong</u>ly disagree <u>Don'</u>t know <u>No o</u>pinion

Comment:

 Please <u>briefly</u> describe trends in HMSA designation activity in your State's metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas since 1980.

b. Whet aspects of the <u>Primary Care HMSA</u> criteria are good and should be retained?

-1-

-2-

 Since 1985has the demand for Federal <u>primary Care HMSA</u> designation <u>increased</u>, <u>decreased</u> or <u>remained the ame</u> for metro and nonmetropolitan areas in your State?

Demand for Primary Care HMSA designation Metr^① politan Nonmetropolitan Increased very much ______ Remained the same ______ Decreased somewhat ______ Decreased very much ______ Den't know _____

 Please indicate whether each of the following hafa(<u>increased</u> <u>decreased</u> or had <u>no effect</u>on the demand fo<u>rederal</u> Primary Care HMSA designations in your State since 1985.

		Factor	has:	
	Increased	Decreased	Had no	Don't
Factor:	demand	demand	<u>effect</u>	Know
a. Need for NHSC personnel				
b Availability of NHSC personnel				
c. Rural Health Clinics Act				
d. Medicare physician bonus payment	_			
e. State programs linked to HNSA				
designation	_	_		
f. Other	_			
g. Other				

6. Has your State filed any **Primary Care HMSA**ications since 1985?

- Y e a ____No (If **no**, skip to question 8.) ____Don't know (If don't knew, skip to question 8.)
- In general, what is your level of satisfaction with how Federal Primary Care HHSA applications have been processed?
 - Very
 satisfied

 Satisfied
 Dissatisfied

 ______Very
 dissatisfied

 ______On't
 know

 ______No
 opinion

Does not apply

If **satisfied** or dissatisfied, what aspect(a) of the **application process** lsd to **your satisfaction** or dissatisfaction?

- 8 If any Federal Primary Care HMSA designations have beer<u>reviewed</u> since 1985, indicate your general level of satisfaction with the Federal <u>review</u> <u>process</u>.
 - Very satisfied <u>Sat</u>isfied Dissatisfied <u>Very</u> dissatisfied <u>Don't</u> k n o w <u>Does</u> not apply, no review <u>No</u> opinion

If **satisfied** or dissatisfied, what aspect(s) of the review proceas have led to your satisfaction or **dissatisfaction**?

- Is your State defining shortage areas for physician specialties (e.g. OB/Cyn) or for non physician health care providers (e.g., nurses)?
 - ____Yes ____No <u>Don'</u>t know

If yes, specify the type of providers for which shortage **areas** are defined and briefly **describe** designation criteria (or, if available attach).

Appendix

D-Background Material for Two OTA Surveys

• 457

B. <u>Medically Underserved Arels (MUA)</u>

- How satisfied are you with the criteria used to designate <u>Federal</u> <u>Medically Underserved <u>BAS</u> (mlAs)?
 </u>
 - Very satisfied Satisfied Dissatisfied Very dissatisfied **Don't** know No opinion

Please **describe** why you are satisfied or dissatisfied.

-3-

-4-

NUA applications				Yes <u>No</u> (If no,skip to question 7.) <u>Don't</u> know (If don't know, skip to question 7.)
Constrained the same for metro and nonsetropolitan areas in your State's Ma solication M				
c. bescribe any problems that you have had in designating medically underserved areas in the rural (inonectropolitan) areas of your state (e.g.designations in frontier areas).				
underserved areas in the rural (incommetropolitan) areas of your State (s.g.designations in frontier areas). state (s.g.designations in frontier areas). ''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''''			.11	Don't know
Ide to your satisfaction or disatisfaction? Increased for metro and noneetropolitan areas in your state? Increased somewhat Increased somewhat </td <td>underserved areas in the rural</td> <td>(i.nonmetropolitan) areas of you</td> <td></td> <td></td>	underserved areas in the rural	(i.nonmetropolitan) areas of you		
Please briefly describe trends in MUA designation activity in your State's and nonmetropolitan areas since 1980. 7. What is your level of satisfaction with the frequency of Pederal MUA review? Please briefly describe trends in MUA designation increased.		-		
Please briefly desribe trends in NUA designation activity in your State's metropolitan areas since 1980. 7. What is your level of satisfaction with the frequency of Federal NUA review? Please briefly desribe trends in NUA designation increased. decreased or remained the same for metro and nonmetropolitan areas in your State? 7. What is your level of satisfaction with the frequency of Federal NUA designation increased. decreased or review? Increased very much increased somewhat conclusion between the same indicate whether each of the following factors has increased. He signal in increased perceased indicate shead or 1985. Now term the NUAs should be reviewed and why. Increased somewhat increased somewhat increased indicate whether each of the following factors has increased. Thore ased indicate shead or 1985. Factor has: Increased or GRGs Increased Decreased Had REAL NOW designations in reviewing Pederal RUAs that is the since 1985. Increased or GRGs Increased Max designations in reviewing Pederal RUAs that increased in the increased Had REAL NOW increased Had REAL NOW Increased or GRGs Increased Max designations in reviewing Pederal RUAs that increased in the increased Had REAL NOW Increased Decreased Had REAL NOW Strongly agree Intereased CRG CRG funds Increased RUA REAL NOW Increased Decreased Had REAL NOW Increased Decreased Had REAL NOW Increased Decreased Had REAL NOW Strongly agree Increased Decreased Had REAL CLINES AND Increased				
metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas since 1980.				
	.ease <u>Driefly</u> describe frends in MUA de letropolitan and nonmetropolitan	signation activity in your Stat areas since 1980.	te's 7.	
Increased somewhat				
<pre>ince 1985, has the demand for Federal NUA designation increased, decreased or remained the same for metro and nonsetropolitan areas in your State? Netropolitan Nonsetropolitan Increased very much Increased very much Decreased very much Decreased somewhat Decreased somewhat Decreased somewhat Decreased very much Decreased had noor't demand demand effect Nuov Therewow wery much Decreased Had nick of CHCs Therewow wery much Decreased Had nick of CHCs Therewow wery much Decreased Had nick of CHC wery wery much Decreased Had nick of CHC wery wery much Decreased Had nick of CHC wery wery much Decreased Very much Decreased Had nick of CHC wery wery much Decreased Had nick of CHC wery wery much Decreased Very Much designations in Very Much CHC wery wery wery much Decreased Very Much developed Very Very Much developed Very Very Much developed Very Very Very Much developed Very</pre>				
Increased the same for metro and nonmetropolitan areas in your State? Nonetropolitan ereas in your State? Marceliant in the metro and nonmetropolitan increased somewhat Increased somewhat Increased somewhat Increased somewhat Decreased very much Increased very much Decreased very much Increased somewhat Decreased very much Increased Decreased very much Increased Decreased very much Increased Decreased very much Increased, somewhat Decreased very much Increased, somewhat Decreased very much Increased, somewhat Decreased or fact on the demand fuferent much Increased, somewhat Iease indicate whether each of the following factors has increased, decreased Had ngon't 8. To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement? Different criteria should be used when reviewing Federal MUAs that increased becreased Had ngon't Strongly agree A g r e e Disagree Inaliability of CKC funds Increased becreased Had ngon't Italiability of CKC funds Increased becreased Had ngon't Italiability of CKC funds Increased becreased Had ngon't Italiability of CKC funds Increased becreased Had ngon 't				
Netropolitan Nonmetropolitan MA_applications				Dissatisfied Very dissatisfied
MUA applications	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u>	842402	Dissatisfied Very dissatisfied Don't know
Increased somewhat Remained the same Decreased somewhat Decreased rery much Door't know Does net apply Lease indicate whether each of the following factors has increased, Lecreased or had no effect on the demand forderal MUA designations in Factor has: To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement? Lease indicate whether each of the following factors has increased, Lecreased or had no effect on the demand forderal MUA designations in Factor has: To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement? Lease indicate whether each of the following factors has increased, Lecreased or had no effect on the demand forderal MUA designations in Factor has: To what extent do you agree or disagree with this statement? Lease defor CHCs The demand demand effect Know and Health Clinics Act Tal Health Clinics Act Tal Health Clinics Act The demand of MUA designation The demand of the demand effect Know Tal Health Clinics Act The demand of MUA designation of the demand of MUA designation of the demand effect Know Tal Health Clinics Act The demand of MUA designation of the demand of MUA designation of the demand effect Know Tal Health Clinics Act The demand of MUA designation of the demand of MUA designation of the demand effect Know Tal Health Clinics Act The demand of MUA designation of the demand of MUA designation of the demand effect Know The demand e	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or remained the same for metro and	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your	State?	Dissatisfied Very dissatisfied Don't know No opinion
Remained the same	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or <u>remained the sa</u> me for metro and <u>Metropo</u> <u>MUA applications</u>	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your	State?	Disgatisfied Very dissatisfied Don't know No oplnion Please comment on why satisfied or dissatisfied and if dissatisfied
Decreased very much Don't know Does net apply lease indicate whether each of the following factors has increased, iscreased or had no effect on the demand f(Federal NUA designations in rour State since 1985. Factor has: Increased Decreased Had n20n't demand demand effect Know al Health Clinics Act The result of CHC funds The result of the demand of the following factors has increased, increased Decreased Had n20n't demand demand effect Know The result of CHC funds The result of CHC funds The result of CHC funds The result of the demand of the following factors has increased, the following factors has increased, The result of CHC funds The result of the demand of the following factors has increased the following factors has increased, the following factors has	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or <u>remained the sam</u> e for metro and <u>Metropo</u> <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your	State?	Disgatisfied Very dissatisfied Don't know No oplnion Please comment on why satisfied or dissatisfied and if dissatisfied
Don't know	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or <u>remained the same</u> for metro and <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much Increased somewhat	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your	State?	Disgatisfied Very dissatisfied Don't know No oplnion Please comment on why satisfied or dissatisfied and if dissatisfied
Does net apply	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or <u>remained</u> the same for metro and <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much Increased somewhat Remained the same Decreased <u>somewhat</u>	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your	State?	Disgatisfied Very dissatisfied Don't know No oplnion Please comment on why satisfied or dissatisfied and if dissatisfied
<pre>lease indicate whether each of the following factors has increased, lecreased or had no effect on the demand forderal MUA designations in rour State since 1985. Factor has: Increased Decreased Had n20n't Agr e e demand demand effect Know ilability of CHC funds</pre>	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or <u>remained the same</u> for metro and <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much Remained the same Decreased somewhat Decreased very much	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your		Dissatisfied Very dissatisfied Don't know No oplnion Please comment on why satisfied or dissatisfied and if dissatisfied specify how often the MUAs should be reviewed and why.
lease indicate whether each of the following factors has <u>increased</u> , area. rour state since 1985. Factor has: Strongly agree Increased Decreased Had nRon't A gr e e idemand demand effect Disagree Strongly disagree Strongly disagree idability of CHC funds - al Health Clinics Act -	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or <u>remained</u> the same for metro and <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much Increased somewhat Remained the same Decreased somewhat Decreased very much Don't know	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your		Dissatisfied Very dissatisfied Don't know No oplnion Please comment on why satisfied or dissatisfied and if dissatisfied specify how often the MUAs should be reviewed and why.
lecreased or had no effect on the demand frequencial MUA designations in Strongly agree rour state since 1985. Factor has: Strongly agree Increased Decreased Had n2on't A g r e e Increased Decreased Had n2on't Strongly disagree storgly disagree Strongly disagree bilability of CHC funds - - ral Health Clinics Act - -	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or <u>remained</u> the same for metro and <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much Increased somewhat Remained the same Decreased somewhat Decreased very much Don't know	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your		Dissatisfied Very dissatisfied Don't know No opinion Please comment on why satisfied or dissatisfied and if dissatisfied specify how often the MUAs should be reviewed and why.
Factor has: Strongly agree Increased Decreased Had n2on't A g r e e C: demand effect Know ad for CHCs - - hilability of CHC funds - - - - - al Health Clinics Act - -	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or <u>remained</u> the same for metro and <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much Remained the same Decreased somewhat Decreased very much Decreased very much	MUA designation increased.decreased d nonmetropolitan areas in your litan Nonmetropolitan	8. d.	Dissatisfied
Information Description Information Information	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or <u>remained</u> the same for metro and <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much Increased somewhat Remained the same Decreased somewhat Decreased very much Decreased very much Don't know Does net apply Lease indicate whether each of the lecreased or had no effect on the dem	MUA designation increased.decreased d nonmetropolitan areas in your litan Nonmetropolitan	8. d.	Dissatisfied
ad for CHCs	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or <u>remained</u> the same for metro and <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much Increased somewhat Remained the same Decreased very much Decreased very much Decreased very much Decreased very much Decreased very much Decreased very much Decreased or had no effect on the dem	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your <u>litan Nonmetropolitan</u> 	8. d.	Dissatisfied
ed for CHCs Don't know	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or <u>remained</u> the same for metro and <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much Increased somewhat Remained the same Decreased somewhat Decreased very much Decreased very much Don't know Does net apply Lease indicate whether each of t <u>decreased</u> or had <u>no effect</u> on the dem your State since 1985.	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your <u>litan Nonmetropolitan</u>	8. 4. -	Dissatisfied
ral Health Clinics Act	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or remained the same for metro and Metropo MUA applications Increased very much Increased somewhat Remained the same Decreased somewhat Decreased very much Don't know Doos net apply lease indicate whether each of t decreased or had no effect on the dem your State since 1985.	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your <u>litan Nonmetropolitan</u>	8. 4. -	Dissatisfied Very dissatisfied Don't know No oplnion Please comment on why satisfied or dissatisfied and if dissatisfied specify how often the MUAs should be reviewed and why.
the second beaution in the second s	ince 1985, has the demand for Federal or remained the same for metro and <u>Metropo</u> <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much memained the same Decreased somewhat Decreased very much Don't know Does net apply lease indicate whether each of the decreased or had no effect on the dem your State since 1985.	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your <u>litan Nonmetropolitan</u> 	8. 4. -	Diss atisfied
	Since 1985, has the demand for Federal or remained the same for metro and Metropo MUA applications Increased very much Increased somewhat Remained the same Decreased somewhat Decreased very much Don't know Does net apply Please indicate whether each of the decreased or had no effect on the dem your State since 1985.	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your <u>litan Nonmetropolitan</u> 	8. 4. -	Diss atisfied
	Since 1985, has the demand for Federal or remained the same for metro and <u>Metropo</u> <u>MUA applications</u> Increased very much Increased somewhat Decreased somewhat Decreased very much Don't know Does net apply Clease indicate whether each of the decreased or had no effect on the dem your State since 1985.	MUA designation <u>increased</u> , <u>decreased</u> d nonmetropolitan areas in your <u>litan Nonmetropolitan</u> 	8. 	Diss atisfied

-

-5-

-6-

c. <u>General Comments orhortage Areas and Medically Underserved Areas</u>

- 1. Does your State have health personnel distribution programs that use some type Of shortage area designation?

Yes No (If no, skip to Question 2.) Don't know (If don't know, skip to Question 2.)

If Yes, please check all <u>State</u> health personnel distribution programs present in your Statand for each checked program indicate whether the Federal HMSA, MUA or State criteria are used to implement the program. In the apace provided belowefly describe any State designation criteria that are used (or, if available, attach).

Brogram Brogent

	roffrem 1	rresent.				
	in Stat	e ?	Shortage	e Desig	gnation	Uaed
			Feder	al	State	
STATE DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS:	Yes	No	HMSA		Designat	ion
1. Educational Programs :						
a. AHECs	<u> </u>					
b. Targeted Primary Care						
training opportunities						
(e.g., residencies)						
c. Seat purchases						
d . Preceptorships			ها 77 انتق اده	÷		
e. Other educational program						
· ··· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
2. Financial Incentives During						
Training						
a. Service-contingent						
loans ● nd scholarships						
b. Other loans						
c. Other scholarship						
d. Other financial incentive						
2						
3. Aid in Practice						
a. Placement						
b. Guaranteed income						
c. Loans						
d. Health professions school						
loan repayment						
e. Malpractice subsidy						
f. Other aid in practice						
4 Ottom Data and (=)						
4. Other Program(s)						
a						
b						
Please briefly describe • IState	destare	ton orit	• • • • • •		1	
if evailable, - attach).	UCSILII	cion cilieri	a chat	are used	(or,	
ii wvaiiabie,- attach).						

a. If your State uses a designation other than the HMSAeror MUA designations to identify shortage areas:

Why doesn't your State use the Federal HMSA or MUA designation for these areas?

- 2. In your opinion, are there areas or populations in your State that have health personnel shortages or are medically undeserved but <u>are</u> not designated as FedelMSAs or MUAs?
- No Yes Don't know No opinion

If Yes, please describe these areas/populations and why they have not been designated

If Yes, are any of these areas/populations are designated as State health personnel shortage or medically underserved areas?

3. In your <u>opinion</u>, are thare areas/populations that are <u>inappropriately</u> designated se Federal HMSAs or NUAs areas/populations that do not have a shortage of health personnelaor are not medically underserved)?

No Yes Don't know No opinion

If \underline{Yes} , please explain why the and \underline{ass} ignatio are inappropriate.

Appendix D—Background Material for Two OTA Surveys

٠ 459

-7-

- 4. In your opinion w effective have the following Federatm(s) been in improving the availability of health services in your State's nonmetropolitan health personnel shortage and medically underserved areas?
 - VE Very Effective
 - E Effective
 - I = Ineffective
 - VI Very ineffective
 - NF Not familiar with Federal program
 - DK Don't know

NO - No opinion							
			LILEC	tivene	SS S		
	VE	E	I	VI	NF	DK	NO
federalprograms							
National Health Service Corps	-			—			
Support of Primary Care educational programs							
AHEC activities							
Community Health Centers							
Rural Health Clinics Act							
Medicare physician payment bonus							
Private loan repayment programs		and the second					
(other than NHSC)					-		<u> </u>
Other (specify)							
other (specily)							
		-		_			
Other (specify)							

- 5. HMSA and MUA designations were originally designed to meet the needs of the NHSC and CHC programs. In your opinion, how appropriate are these designations for other Federal programs auch as the Rural Health clinics Act and Medicare incentive payments?
 - Appropriate _____Inappropriate Very inappropriate Don't know No opinion

6. Does your atate delineate primary caservice areas?



If **Yes**, please **briefly**escribe how tha **areas are** &fined

- 7 Does your State conduct any special surveys of primary care providers monitor shortage areas/underserved areas or as part of your HMSA/MU designation activities?
 - Yes No Don't know

If Yes, please briefly describe the surveys.

8. Has the withdrawal of Federal planning resources (e.g., State Health Planning and Development Agency (SHPDA) funds) had a positive, negative, or no effect on your State's ability to prepare requeats for HMSA/MUA designation?

	Very positive (describe)
	Somewhat positive (describe)
	Somewhat negative (describe)
	Very negative (describe)
-	No effect

- 9. In generalare your State/Federal resources adequate for maintaining an accurate and up-to-date set of health personnel shortage areas and medically undersexed areas?
 - Yes No Don't know No opinion

If No, please describe what resources are inadequate

10 If av ailable please send us any State asps you have prepared that ahow the location of any of the following: Federal HMSAs, MUAs, Statedesignated shortage are CHCs, NHSC sites, certified Rural Health Clinics, and/or primary care service areas.

D <u>Genera</u> Comments

Please provide any additional general comments that you have about the designation of primary care personnel shortage areas or medically underserved areas that have not been covered adequately by this questionnaire?

Comments:

Please return this questionnaire by 4August in the self-addressed envelope enclosed or send to:

Rita Hughes Office of Technology Assessment Health Program 600 Pennsylvania Avenue, S.E. Washington D.C. 20003

-11-