Purpose and process
The Ohio Department of Health (ODH) commissioned the Health Policy Institute of Ohio (HPIO) to facilitate development of Ohio’s next State Health Assessment (SHA) and State Health Improvement Plan (SHIP). As part of this process, HPIO facilitated a series of five regional forums in October 2018 and administered an online survey to gather input from a wide variety of community stakeholders across the state. Findings from the regional forums and survey will be included in Ohio’s next SHA and will inform identification of priorities and strategies in the next SHIP.

The purposes of the forums and the survey were to gather information across regions and for urban, suburban, Appalachian and non-Appalachian rural counties on:

- **Strengths and challenges**: Identify community strengths and challenges
- **Equity**: Identify priority populations (groups experiencing the worst health outcomes) and key disparities and inequities
- **Priorities**: Gather input on the three priority topics, 10 priority outcomes and cross-cutting factors in the 2017-2019 SHIP
- **SHA/SHIP improvements**: Gather feedback to guide improvements to the next SHA and SHIP documents, supplemental materials and related ODH guidance and technical assistance

A total of 622 Ohioans participated in a regional forum and/or completed the survey, with representation from all 88 Ohio counties. 521 participants attended the regional forums and 308 respondents completed the online survey. (Some participated in both.)

Local health departments and hospitals are the organizations charged with leading SHIP implementation at the local level. Both types of organizations were well-represented in both the forums and the survey. In addition, representatives from many other sectors participated, including behavioral health, education, disability and job training/workforce development.

Key finding 1. The 2017-2019 SHIP health outcome priorities continue to be consistent with local community priorities. Several cross-cutting factors also rise to the top as important to emphasize in the next SHIP, including poverty, transportation, physical activity, nutrition and access to care. Survey respondents were asked to provide feedback on the SHIP’s three broad priority topics (mental health and addiction, chronic disease, maternal and infant health) and
Figure ES.2. **Main components of SHIP framework**

- **3 priority topics**
  - Mental health and addiction
  - Chronic disease
  - Maternal and infant health

- **10 priority outcomes**
  - Specific and measurable

**Cross-cutting factors**
- Social determinants of health
- Public health system, prevention and health behaviors
- Healthcare system and access
- Equity

**Note:** See figure 1.4 in the full report for details.

Respondents reported that the three broad priority topics in the 2017-2019 SHIP were still highly consistent with the priorities they identified in their own communities. Figure ES.3 displays the percent of respondents who indicated these priorities were a “high” or “moderate” priority in their county(ies).

In addition, respondents reported that the SHIP cross-cutting factors are also “high” or “moderate” priorities in their community (see figure ES.4).

Finally, respondents prioritized barriers to equity, which provide more specific insight on the social drivers that should be carefully considered during development of the next SHA and SHIP. The top-five “most important” barriers to address in order to improve health outcomes for groups with the worst health outcomes (priority populations) are listed in figure ES.5.

**Figure ES.3. SHIP priority alignment with current local priorities**

“Based on results of community assessments and plans in your community, to what extent are the three broad priority topics from the 2017-2019 SHIP a HIGH or MODERATE priority for your county(ies)?” (n=306-308)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority Topic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mental health and addiction</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic disease</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal and infant health</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** 2018 SHA regional forum online survey

**Figure ES.4. Top-five cross-cutting factors**

“Based on results of community assessments and plans in your community, to what extent are the cross-cutting factors from the 2017-2019 SHIP a HIGH or MODERATE priority in your county(ies)?” (n=282-305)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cross-cutting Factor</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to health care</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical activity and nutrition</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and economic environment (employment, poverty, income, education, family and social support)</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity, disparities and inequities</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical environment (housing, transportation, air, water and food and active living environments, etc.)</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** 2018 SHA regional forum online survey
Key finding 2. While each Ohio community is unique, there are many shared strengths, challenges and priorities across the state.

During the regional forum small group discussions, participants described many strengths and challenges that were unique to their community or area of the state. For example:

- Urban and suburban participants cited ample resources, availability of specific healthcare services and economic vitality as unique strengths, while Appalachian and rural non-Appalachian participants highlighted positive cultural attitudes in their communities, such as having friendly people and a focus on “taking care of our own.”
- The southwest region, which has been particularly hard-hit by the opioid crisis, identified Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACEs), grandparents raising grandchildren and strain on the foster care system as major challenges.
- Transportation is a priority everywhere, but the specific nature of transportation challenges varies by area. In the southeast region, for example, long distances to jobs, grocery stores and health care and limited infrastructure present unique obstacles to wellbeing.

An over-riding theme from the forums and survey results is that there are several major trends, challenges and priorities that are shared by communities of all kinds across the state. For example:

- Increased focus on prevention and the social determinants of health was cited as a top-10 positive trend in small group discussions for all regions and all county types.
- Transportation was identified as a top-10 challenge for all five regions and all county types.
- Mental health and addiction was the top health outcome priority rated by survey respondents from all regions and all county types.
- Access to health care and physical activity and nutrition are high-priority cross-cutting factors in all regions and across county types.

Figure ES.5. Top-five barriers to equity

“Which of the following barriers do you think are most important to address in order to improve [health outcomes for priority populations in your county(ies)]?" (n=302)

- Income and poverty: 71%
- Transportation: 50%
- Access to health care: 38%
- Housing: 33%
- Toxic stress and trauma: 31%

Source: 2018 SHA regional forum online survey
Key finding 3. There are many opportunities to improve the next SHA and SHIP to ensure they are useful for local partners.

Most survey respondents reported that the SHA (72 percent) and SHIP (71 percent) were “very” or “somewhat” effective at contributing to improvements in health assessments and plans developed by local health departments and hospitals in 2017 and 2018. Most respondents agreed that the SHA, SHIP and related ODH guidance led to increased:

- Alignment between local health departments and state SHIP priorities
- Identification of useful indicators/metrics and development of measurable outcome objectives
- Partnerships with sectors beyond health (education, housing, transportation, etc)
- Collaboration between local health departments and hospitals on community health improvement activities

Many forum attendees reported confusion about how to use the SHA, SHIP and guidance documents and offered actionable suggestions for increasing awareness and ease of use, for example:

- Make the SHA and SHIP more concise and user-friendly
- Expand dissemination and higher-visibility roll-out
- Increase outreach to all partners, including sectors beyond health

See figure ES.6 for additional recommendations.

Figure ES.6. Most frequent recommendations to improve the SHA and SHIP

Top-10 recommendations from forum participants and survey respondents (n=42 small group discussions and 153 survey respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dissemination and outreach</th>
<th>ODH guidance, technical assistance and implementation infrastructure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Concise and user-friendly</td>
<td>• Provide technical assistance (general)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expand dissemination/Higher-visibility roll-out (general)</td>
<td>• Fund SHIP strategies at state and local level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase outreach and awareness to sectors beyond health</td>
<td>• More efficient data process for locals (state should provide locals with data for their assessments and/or coordinate use of the same surveys and other data sources to avoid duplication of effort and to allow for comparisons between local and state-level data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase outreach and awareness to health-related organizations</td>
<td>• Peer-to-peer sharing (facilitate opportunities for local communities to learn from each other about assessments and SHIP strategy selection, implementation and evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increase outreach to partners and awareness (general, unspecified)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tailor for different audiences (talking points or user guides for different types of organizations and sectors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHA format and content</th>
<th>SHIP format and content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Local or regional data in SHA</td>
<td>• Include success stories (provide examples of communities that have implemented SHIP strategies and achieved positive outcomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional disaggregated data (by disability status, race/ethnicity, etc.) in SHA</td>
<td>• Flexible options for different types of counties for SHIP implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional specific metrics/topics related to social determinants of health</td>
<td>• Regular reporting of progress on SHIP outcomes/SHIP dashboard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Download the full SHA Regional Forums Findings report at www.hpio.net/sha-ship