

Volusia County School Based Preventive Dental Program Summary 2012 - 2013

# Schools		GRADE	# ENROLLED	# CHILD ASSESSED	# PARENT REFUSED	% TREAT	# OHI	# CHILD SEALED	# TEETH SEALED	# FLUOR TX
1	Blue Lake Elem	K,1,2,3,4,5	597	346	251	52.8	597	229	1,070	302
2	Champion Elem	1,2,3	170	162	8	91.8	170	111	418	152
3	Enterprise Elem	1,2,3	282	174	108	59.6	282	127	469	158
4	Friendship Elem	1,2,3	228	152	76	61.4	228	109	370	134
5	Holly Hill Elem	1,2,3	320	174	146	49.1	320	122	461	153
6	McInnis Elem	1,2,3	182	143	39	67.9	182	87	287	125
7	Orange City Elem	1,2,3	312	248	64	65.3	312	131	433	203
8	Osceola Elem	1,2,3	216	161	55	66.2	216	95	326	143
9	Palm Terrace Elem	K,1,2,3,4,5	554	317	237	52	554	228	1,078	284
10	Pierson Elem	1,2,3	296	200	96	65.2	296	133	403	190
11	RJ Longstreet	1,2,3	188	138	50	64.9	188	80	292	113
12	Spirit Elem	1,2,3	324	218	116	61.4	324	142	520	197
13	Stark Elem	K,1,2,3,4,5	370	268	102	70.5	370	197	957	261
14	Turie T. Elem	K,1,2,3,4,5	447	299	148	59.1	447	172	787	260
15	Westside Elem	K,1,2,3,4,5	508	349	159	60	508	220	1,043	301
				3349						
# Schools		GRADE	# ENROLLED	# CHILD ASSESSED	# PARENT REFUSED	% TREAT	# OHI	# CHILD SEALED	# TEETH SEALED	# FLUOR TX
15		Mixed	4994	3349	1645	63.14	4994	2183	8914	2976

CDC SEALS PROGRAM

SUMMARY STATISTICS FOR PROGRAM:

2012 Volusia County School Based Preventive Program

2012

- 2013

GENERAL DEMOGRAPHICS

Number of events held	15	
% male	49.6	% reporting sex 99.9
% Medicaid patients	62.6	% SCHIP patients 0.1
% on neither	37.3	% reporting Medicaid/SCHIP status 99.8
% White†	42.9	% Asian† 1.1
% Black/African American‡	36.4	% Hispanic‡ 24.2
% American Indian/Alaska Native‡	1.8	% Other‡ 3.7
% Hawaiian/Pacific Islander‡	0.1	% reporting race 99.9

Summary of effectiveness in targeting high-risk populations that lack access to care

	value	% of participants	% response
1. Participants with untreated decay (baseline)	1253	41.0	99.9
2. Participants with urgent dental needs (baseline)	346	11.3	99.9
3. Participants with early dental needs (baseline)	898	29.4	99.9
4. Participants with treated or untreated decay (baseline)	1774	58.0	99.9
5. Participants with sealants present (baseline)	1013	33.1	99.9
6. Percentage of events targeting children in schools with <20% of students in free or reduced lunch program	0.0		
7. Percentage of events targeting children in schools with >=20% & <40% of students in free or reduced lunch p	0.0		
8. Percentage of events targeting children in schools with >=40% & <50% of students in free or reduced lunch p	0.0		
9. Percentage of events targeting children in schools with >=50% of students in free or reduced lunch program	100.0		

Summary of effectiveness of targeting high-risk teeth

1. Percentage of events targeting 1st molars	100.0	
2. Percentage of events targeting 1st molars of second graders	100.0	
3. Percentage of events targeting 2nd molars	100.0	
4. Percentage of events targeting 2nd molars of sixth graders	0.0	
5. 1.5-year attack rate in 1st molar surfaces (baseline) / based on # children	0.024	1578
6. Estimated 9-year decay increment in 1st molar surfaces without program	895	
7. Among children age 12+, percentage of decayed or filled 2nd molar surfaces / based on # children	0.0	21
8. Estimated 9-year decay increment in 2nd molar surfaces without program**	39	

Summary of services delivered

	value	% response
1. Number of children screened	3060	
2. Number of screened children with special health care needs	289	
3. Number of children sealed	2183	
4. Percentage of screened children with at least one sealant after event	85.3	
5. Percentage of screened children subsequently sealed*	71.4	99.9
6. Average number of surfaces sealed per child sealed	4.1	
7. Number of children receiving fluoride varnish	2976	
8. Number of children receiving other fluoride treatments	0	

9. Number of children referred for dental care	1224
10. Number of children receiving oral health education	4994
11. Average hours of oral health education received per student instructed	0.5

Summary of quality of services delivered

	value
1. Number of referrals that resulted in a dental visit	0
2. Percentage of "early dental care" referrals that resulted in a dental visit*	0.0
3. Percentage of "urgent care" referrals that resulted in a dental visit*	0.0
4. Number of children evaluated for sealant retention 8 to 14 months from delivery	0
5. Number of children evaluated for sealant retention <8 months / >14 months from delivery	0 0
6. Sealant retention rate / # children based on	0.000 0
7. 1st molar cavities averted by program (9-year horizon)	0
8. 2nd molar cavities averted by program (9-year horizon)¶	0

Summary of efficiency of input usage

	Total outlays	Direct state funds	unds + Medicaid reimb
1. Total cost	\$177,607.15	\$0.00	\$0.00
2. Cost per child screened	\$58.04	\$0.00	\$0.00
3. Cost per child sealed	\$81.36	\$0.00	\$0.00
4. Cost per surface sealed	\$19.92	\$0.00	\$0.00
5. Cost per cavity averted	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
6. Number of children screened per chair hour	10.27		
7. Number of children sealed per chair hour	2.31		
8. Number of children checked for sealant retention per chair hour	0.00		
9. Number of labor hours per chair hour during screening	2.45		
10. Number of labor hours per chair hour during sealing	1.69		
11. Number of labor hours per chair hour during retention check	0.00		
12. Administrative time (including organization, setup, and breakdown) per child screened (in hours)	0.19		

‡ The sum of the percentages in all racial/ethnic groups may exceed 100%, as more than one group may be reported per child.

* based on responses not entered as "99"

** based on 1st molar attack rate

¶ based on cavities averted per sealant for 1st molars

