

Issue	Feedback	Additional considerations
<b>Characteristics of an ideal infrastructure</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>One SHA/SHIP reflecting total health in Ohio</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All interested state level agencies, coalitions, and advocacy groups are involved in the planning process</li> <li>SHA/SHIP is an "umbrella plan" that can be utilized by all entities</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alignment with state and national priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HP 2020, National Prevention Strategies</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local priorities and strategies feed into SHA/SHIP</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar process for assessment</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar core questions</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar methodology</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar timing (same intervals for CHNAs and CHIPs)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 3 year cycle would work for most</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consistent data elements and standards, benchmarks and measurements</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local, regional, state level progress can be measured both by process and outcome measures</li> <li>Allow for a statewide "roll up" of effort and impact</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Work as a coalition; multiple sectors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Steering committee that leverages multiple perspectives</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mechanism with "teeth" or a "carrot" to assure collaboration with critical partners</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include public health and health care, but also other critical partners that are essential in addressing population health issues upstream</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maximum flexibility in current and future funding streams to allow communities to tackle their high priority issues</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Neutral, well respected convener in the region</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Staff with diverse backgrounds (degrees, rural vs. urban)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Multiple funders paying for the assessment</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Delineate clear roles and responsibilities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Include name of contact person, not just entity</li> <li>Ensure contact person can "get the work done"</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Meet regularly with coalition to track</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Monthly is better than quarterly</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>outcomes</li> <li>Develop annual goals</li> <li>Use evidence-based strategies in the CHIP/IS</li> <li>Transparent and easily useable HA/IPs</li> <li>CHNA/IP identifies needs and seeks improvements across the life course</li> <li>Use existing resources effectively</li> <li>Disparities are a fundamental component of every assessment and plan</li> <li>Common definition of community</li> <li>Frequent measurement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Mix of policies, programs and environmental strategies</li> <li>Stress use of fidelity and pre/post tests</li> <li>SDH provides a clear common denominator</li> <li>Make key stakeholders aware of statewide data sources and relevant population health measures</li> <li>Defining need at the neighborhood level (micro) may be vital as interventions are put into place (or tested, initially at smaller scale)</li> <li>Population-based data from multiple sectors</li> <li>Neighborhood-level assessments may be more relevant than state- or county-level</li> <li>Facilitating linkages between datasets from different sectors relevant to health</li> </ul>
<b>What should not change?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessing needs at both the state and local levels</li> <li>No issue around hospital/LHD collaboration in NW Ohio</li> <li>Hospitals help inform LHD assessment and implementation strategies in NE Ohio</li> <li>Build on existing collaboration efforts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Highlight models that are working and spend some time discussing how similar models might work where there is not an exact "fit" between public health and the health care system</li> </ul>
<b>What should be improved or changed?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>More collaboration around implementation strategies</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• One plan with multiple levels</li> <li>• Many routes for health improvement</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local level choice as to which route to take</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional health priorities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start with a solid CHNA</li> <li>• Take into consideration rural and urban counties</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better and more frequent community health data collection</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data should be shared</li> <li>• Data should be at the neighborhood level</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better dispersal of evidence-based practices</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase funding for prevention</li> </ul>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase incentives for prevention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Example: reimbursements for services like legal aid connections</li> <li>• Removing barriers that compete with achievement of health (like housing or food insecurity)</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Redefine community benefit</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove barriers: make health achievable for high risk populations</li> <li>• Transparency: aligning community benefit activities around SMART local and state objectives</li> <li>• “Make it easy” for hospitals to truly make change that benefits the community</li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The state can and should play a critical role in bringing together the health care system and the public health system</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No need for health care to build its own separate structure and resources to attack population health issues</li> <li>• Local public health is a ready and willing partner with expertise, experience, data, lots of other benefits to bring to the table</li> <li>• Need communication, collaboration, and maximum leveraging of available resources</li> </ul>

**Health Policy Institute of Ohio**

Population Health Planning Infrastructure Subgroup

**Group feedback**

*Working draft; subject to change*

Updated 10/28/2015 3:05 PM

<b>Team member providing feedback</b>	<b>Organization</b>
Andrew Beck	Cincinnati Children's Hospital Med Center
Beth Bickford	Association of Ohio Health Commissioners
Kristin Craciun	Center for Health Affairs
Corey Hamilton	Zanesville-Muskingum County Health Dept.
Britney Ward	Hospital Council NW Ohio