Table 1 reports the total number of community members served by the UIHPs and the percentage who are American Indian or Alaska Native (AI/AN).

**Table 1. Total Patients and Demographic Information** 

Back to top

Description	Outreach & Referral (n=5)		Limited Ambulatory (n=7)		Fu Ambul (n=2	atory	Total (n=35)		
	Total	AI/AN	Total	AI/AN	Total	Al/AN	Total	AI/AN	
Total Patients	1,667	1,580	5,437	4,789	165,461	71,037	172,565	77,406	
% Al/AN (1)	95%		88%		43%		45%		
Male	716	691	2,150	1,949	68,749	29,517	71,615	32,157	
Female	916	889	3,197	2,840	92,528	41,519	96,641	45,248	
% Pediatric (<15 yrs)	11%	11%	13%	14%	21%	18%	21%	18%	
% Geriatric (65+ yrs)	8%	8%	8%	8%	7%	6%	7%	6%	
% Women (15-44 yrs)	28%	28%	29%	29%	27%	30%	27%	30%	
% Minority (2)	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		
% Linguistic Barrier	n/a		n/a		n/a		n/a		

<sup>(1)</sup> Calculated as the percent of patients who are Al/AN out of total patients. (2) Ethnicity and Linguistic data not available in NDW. NOTE: Percentages are rounded

Table 2 reports socioeconomic characteristics of patients served by UIHP funded programs.

**Table 2. Socioeconomic Characteristics** 

Back to top

								Dack to top
Description	Outreach & Referral (n=5)		Limited Ambulatory (n=7)		Ful Ambula (n=2	atory	Total (n=35)	
	Total	AI/AN	Total	Total Al/AN		AI/AN	Total	AI/AN
Total Patients	1,667	1,580	5,437	4,789	165,461	71,037	172,565	77,406
% AI/AN (1)	95%		88%		43%		45%	
% <= 100% FPL (2)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% <= 200% FPL (2)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Unknown (3)	70%	72%	48%	49%	28%	31%	29%	33%
% Medicaid	19%	19%	37%	37%	50%	41%	50%	40%
% Medicare	4%	4%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%	8%
% Other Public (2)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Private	10%	9%	17%	16%	26%	39%	26%	37%

(1) Calculated as the percent of patients who are Al/AN out of total patients.
(2) Federal Poverty Level (FPL) and Other Public insurance data not available in NDW.
(3) Uninsured data not available in NDW, but "Unknown" can be determined by NULL insurance data values.

NOTE: Percentages are rounded

Table 3 reports trends (2012-2016) in Patients Served and Total Visits, for both Universal and Al/AN populations.

**Table 3. Trend In Patients Served And Visits** 

Back to top

Description: Universal (1)	2012 (n=27)	2013 (n=27)	2014 (n=27)	2015 (n=32)	2016 (n=35)	Gross Change 2015-2016	% Change 2015-2016
Total Number of Patients Served/All Programs	84,201	85,515	83,592	126,732	172,565	45,833	27%
Total Medical Patients Served	68,373	67,242	62,640	84,611	123,877	39,266	32%
Total Visits	519,764	539,211	581,965	518,316	1,151,050	632,734	55%
Description: Al/AN (1)	2012 (n=27)	2013 (n=27)	2014 (n=27)	2015 (n=32)	2016 (n=35)	Gross Change 2015-2016	% Change 2015-2016
Total Number of Al/AN Patients Served/All Programs	38,650	44,457	43,359	45,391	77,406	32,015	41%
% of Total Patients who are Al/AN (% of total patients)	46%	52%	52%	36%	45%	9%	25%
Total Al/AN Medical Patients Served	30,560	33,801	32,312	27,118	53,871	26,753	50%
Total Al/AN Visits	340,829	357,934	390,911	197,751	677,246	479,495	71%

<sup>(1)</sup> Historical data (2012-2014) is from NDW data (RPMS Sites) only. 2015 data is all from UDS software. 2016 data is primarily from NDW data, and includes data from 8 Full Ambulatory Sites (non-RPMS) that have submitted data via the UDS software.

Table 4 compares the total population and the Al/AN population served by UIHPs on selected socioeconomic characteristics.

**Table 4. Patient Access** 

Back to top

						Dack to top
2012 (n=27)	2013 (n=27)	2014 (n=27)	2015 (n=32)	2016 (n=35)	Gross Change 2015-2016	% Change 2015-2016
81%	79%	75%	67%	72%	5%	7%
10%	12%	11%	19%	21%	2%	11%
3%	4%	5%	6%	7%	1%	17%
16%	18%	17%	28%	27%	-1%	-4%
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	-n/a	n/a
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
32%	30%	29%	35%	29%	-6%	-17%
38%	40%	42%	48%	50%	2%	4%
10%	10%	11%	6%	8%	2%	33%
2012 (n=27)	2013 (n=27)	2014 (n=27)	2015 (n=32)	2016 (n=35)	Gross Change 2015-2016	% Change 2015-2016
79%	76%	75%	60%	70%	10%	17%
21%	21%	20%	14%	18%	4%	29%
6%	6%	7%	5%	6%	1%	20%
31%	31%	30%	30%	30%	0%	0%
n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
	(n=27) 81% 10% 3% 16% n/a n/a 32% 38% 10% 2012 (n=27) 79% 21% 6% 31%	(n=27)         (n=27)           81%         79%           10%         12%           3%         4%           16%         18%           n/a         n/a           32%         30%           38%         40%           10%         10%           2012         2013           (n=27)         76%           21%         21%           6%         6%           31%         31%	(n=27)         (n=27)         (n=27)           81%         79%         75%           10%         12%         11%           3%         4%         5%           16%         18%         17%           n/a         n/a         n/a           n/a         n/a         n/a           32%         30%         29%           38%         40%         42%           10%         10%         11%           2012         2013         2014         (n=27)           79%         76%         75%           21%         21%         20%           6%         6%         7%           31%         31%         30%	(n=27)         (n=27)         (n=27)         (n=32)           81%         79%         75%         67%           10%         12%         11%         19%           3%         4%         5%         6%           16%         18%         17%         28%           n/a         n/a         n/a         n/a           n/a         n/a         n/a         n/a           32%         30%         29%         35%           38%         40%         42%         48%           10%         10%         11%         6%           2012         2013         2014         2015         (n=32)           79%         76%         75%         60%           21%         21%         20%         14%           6%         6%         7%         5%           31%         31%         30%         30%	(n=27)         (n=27)         (n=32)         (n=35)           81%         79%         75%         67%         72%           10%         12%         11%         19%         21%           3%         4%         5%         6%         7%           16%         18%         17%         28%         27%           n/a         n/a         n/a         n/a           n/a         n/a         n/a         n/a           n/a         n/a         n/a         n/a           32%         30%         29%         35%         29%           38%         40%         42%         48%         50%           10%         10%         11%         6%         8%           2012         2013         2014         2015         (n=35)           79%         76%         75%         60%         70%           21%         21%         20%         14%         18%           6%         6%         7%         5%         6%           31%         31%         30%         30%         30%         30%	(n=27)         (n=27)         (n=32)         (n=35)         2015-2016           81%         79%         75%         67%         72%         5%           10%         12%         11%         19%         21%         2%           3%         4%         5%         6%         7%         1%           16%         18%         17%         28%         27%         -1%           n/a         n/a         n/a         n/a         -n/a           n/a         n/a         n/a         n/a         -n/a           n/a         n/a         n/a         n/a         n/a           n/a         n/a         n/a         n/a         n/a           32%         30%         29%         35%         29%         -6%           38%         40%         42%         48%         50%         2%           2012         2013         2014         2015         2016         Gross Change 2015-2016           79%         76%         75%         60%         70%         10%           21%         21%         20%         14%         18%         4%           6%         6%         7%         5% </th

% Al/AN <= 200% Poverty (1)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
% Al/AN Unknown (2)	28%	29%	29%	43%	33%	-10%	-23%
% Al/AN with Medicaid or SCHIP coverage (3)	41%	41%	43%	36%	40%	4%	11%
% Al/AN with Medicare coverage	11%	10%	11%	6%	8%	2%	33%

Table 5 reports the percentage of all of the patients seen in the program who received services in each of the seven discrete service categories.

**Table 5. Patients By Service** 

Back to top

Description	Outreach & Referral (n=5)		Limited Ambulatory (n=7)		Fu Ambul (n=2	atory	Total (n=29)		
	Total	AI/AN	Total	AI/AN	Total	Al/AN	Total	AI/AN	
Total Patients	1,667	1,580	5,437	4,789	165,461	71,037	172,565	77,406	
% Al/AN (1)	95%		88%		43%		45%		
% Medical	14%	15%	50%	48%	73%	72%	72%	70%	
% Dental	8%	9%	1%	1%	25%	23%	24%	21%	
% Mental Health	13%	13%	11%	11%	8%	12%	8%	12%	
% Substance Abuse	4%	3%	5%	5%	5%	4%	5%	4%	
% Other Professional	0%	0%	8%	9%	4%	7%	4%	7%	
% Vision	0%	0%	0%	0%	3%	6%	3%	5%	
% Enabling	47%	48%	43%	48%	16%	23%	17%	25%	

<sup>(1)</sup> Calculated as the percent of patients who are Al/AN out of total patients. NOTE: Percentages are rounded

As reported in Table 6, Urban Indian Health funded programs provide continuity of care as evidenced by the average number of visits per patient by service category.

Table 6. Visits By Service

Back to top

Description		Outreach & Referral (n=5)		Limited Ambulatory (n=7)		I atory (3)	Total (n=35)	
		AI/AN	Total	AI/AN	Total	AI/AN	Total	AI/AN
Total Visits	8,716	8,160	35,966	32,731	1,106,368	636,355	1,151,050	677,246
Medical Visit per Medical Patient (1)	0.88	0.88	2.65	2.69	3.90	4.76	3.87	4.66
Dental Visit per Dental Patient	1.71	1.71	1.04	1.04	2.89	2.50	2.88	2.49
Mental Health Visit per MH Patient	5.26	5.39	5.28	4.65	5.46	5.46	5.45	5.41
Substance Abuse Visit per SA Patient	14.68	15.93	11.18	11.95	4.69	7.52	4.98	7.96
Other Professional Visit per OP Patient	1.00	1.00	4.54	4.42	4.63	5.40	4.62	5.31
Total Vision Visits per Vision Patient	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	1.76	1.90	1.76	1.90
Enabling Visit per Enabling Patient	3.49	3.50	4.46	4.51	2.18	2.70	2.39	2.95

<sup>(1)</sup> Federal Poverty Level (FPL) data not available in NDW.
(2) Uninsured data not available in NDW, but "Unknown" can be determined by NULL insurance data values.
(3) Medicaid data is available, but SCHIP data is not available in the NDW.
(4) Historical data (2012-2014) is from NDW data (RPMS Sites) only. 2015 data is all from UDS software. 2016 data is primarily from NDW data, and includes data from 8 Full Ambulatory Sites (non-RPMS) that have submitted data via the UDS software.

(1) Medical visits exclude nursing visits.

Table 7 reports trends in visits per patient by three utilization categories.

**Table 7. Utilization** 

Back to top

Description: Universal	2012 (n=27)	2013 (n=27)	2014 (n=27)	2015 (n=32)	2016 (n=35)	Gross Change 2015-2016	% Change 2015-2016
Medical Visits per Medical Patient (1)	2.92	3.36	3.77	2.95	3.87	0.92	1.32%
Substance Abuse Visits Per SA Patient	6.84	7.15	6.36	7.70	4.98	-2.72	0.65%
Mental Health Visits Per MH Patient	4.71	4.58	5.14	7.93	5.45	-2.48	0.69%

<sup>(1)</sup> Medical visits exclude nursing visits.

**NOTE:** Tables 8-22 are currently under evaluation.