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Losing ground in population health

Case A, Deaton A. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 2015
Geographic & socioeconomic inequities in population health

Chetty et al. JAMA 2016
How do we support effective population health improvement strategies?

- Designed to achieve large-scale health improvement: neighborhood, city/county, region
- Improve the mean and reduce the variance (equity)
- Target fundamental and often multiple determinants of health
- Mobilize the collective actions of multiple stakeholders in government & private sector
  - Infrastructure
  - Information
  - Incentives

Multiple systems & sectors drive health...

![Pie chart showing proportional contribution to premature death.](image)

- Genetic predisposition: 30%
- Behavioral patterns: 40%
- Social circumstances: 15%
- Environmental exposure: 5%
- Health care: 10%

...But existing systems often fail to connect

Medical Care
- Fragmentation
- Duplication
- Variability in practice
- Limited accessibility
- Episodic and reactive care
- Insensitivity to consumer values & preferences
- Limited targeting of resources to community needs

Social Services & Supports

Public Health
- Fragmentation
- Variability in practice
- Resource constrained
- Limited reach
- Insufficient scale
- Limited public visibility & understanding
- Limited evidence base
- Slow to innovate & adapt

Waste & inefficiency
Inequitable outcomes
Limited population health impact
Challenge: overcoming collective action problems across systems & sectors

- Incentive compatibility → public goods
- Concentrated costs & diffuse benefits
- Time lags: costs vs. improvements
- Uncertainties about what works
- Asymmetry in information
- Difficulties measuring progress
- Weak and variable institutions & infrastructure
- Imbalance: resources vs. needs
- Stability & sustainability of funding

Ostrom E. 1994
Widely recommended activities to support multi-sector initiatives in population health

Foundational Capabilities

- Engage stakeholders
- Assess needs & risks
- Identify evidence-based actions
- Develop shared priorities & plans
- Commit shared resources & responsibilities
- Coordinate Implementation
- Monitor, evaluate, feed back

Questions of interest

- How strong are the delivery systems that support foundational capabilities for population health?
- How do these delivery systems change over time?
- How do these delivery systems influence health and economic outcomes?

Economics | Policy | Leadership
A useful lens for studying multi-sector work

National Longitudinal Survey of Public Health Systems

- Cohort of 360 communities with at least 100,000 residents
- Local public health officials report:
  - **Scope**: availability of 20 recommended population health activities
  - **Network**: organizations contributing to each activity
  - **Centrality of effort**: contributed by governmental public health agency
  - **Quality**: perceived effectiveness of each activity

** Expanded sample of 500 communities<100,000 added in 2014 wave
Data linkages expand analytic possibilities

- **Area Health Resource File**: health resources, demographics, socioeconomic status, insurance coverage

- **NACCHO Profile data**: public health agency institutional and financial characteristics

- **CMS Impact File & Cost Report**: hospital ownership, market share, uncompensated care

- **Dartmouth Atlas**: Area-level medical spending (Medicare)

- **CDC Compressed Mortality File**: Cause-specific death rates by county

- **Equality of Opportunity Project (Chetty)**: local estimates of life expectancy by income

- **National Health Interview Survey**: individual-level health

- **HCUP**: area-level hospital and ED use, readmissions
Variation in implementing foundational population health activities


Percent of U.S. communities

Percent of activities performed
Mapping who contributes to population health

Node size = degree centrality
Line size = % activities jointly contributed (tie strength)

Classifying multi-sector delivery systems for population health 1998-2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Centrality</th>
<th>Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Mod</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Network density and scope of activities

Comprehensive Systems

Mays GP et al. Health Affairs 2016
Comprehensive Systems
One of RWJF’s Culture of Health National Metrics

- **Broad scope** of population health activities
- **Dense network** of multi-sector relationships
- **Central actors** to coordinate actions

Access to public health

Overall, 47.2 percent of the population is covered by a comprehensive public health system. Individuals are more likely to have access if they are non-White (51.5 percent vs. 45.5 percent White) or live in a metropolitan area (48.7 percent vs. 34.1 percent in nonmetropolitan areas).

Variation and change in comprehensive delivery systems
## Implementation of foundational activities, 1998-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Conduct periodic assessment of community health status and needs</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>87.1%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Survey community for behavioral risk factors</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Investigate adverse health events, outbreaks and hazards</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conduct laboratory testing to identify health hazards and risks</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>96.1%</td>
<td>-0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Analyze data on community health status and health determinants</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
<td>72.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Analyze data on preventive services use</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Routinely provide community health information to elected officials</td>
<td>80.9%</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Routinely provide community health information to the public</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Routinely provide community health information to the media</td>
<td>75.2%</td>
<td>89.0%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Prioritize community health needs</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>83.6%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Engage community stakeholders in health improvement planning</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>68.8%</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Develop a community-wide health improvement plan</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>87.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Identify and allocate resources based on community health plan</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Develop policies to address priorities in community health plan</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Maintain a communication network among health-related organizations</td>
<td>78.8%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Link people to needed health and social services</td>
<td>75.6%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>-33.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Implement legally mandated public health activities</td>
<td>91.4%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Evaluate health programs and services in the community</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Evaluate local public health agency capacity and performance</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>56.1%</td>
<td>-0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Monitor and improve implementation of health programs and policies</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>-1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean performance of assessment activities (#1-6)                                           | 67.0% | 77.7% | 15.9%    |
Mean performance of policy and planning activities (#7-15)                                  | 63.9% | 75.5% | 18.3%    |
Mean performance of implementation and assurance activities (#16-20)                        | 61.1% | 56.6% | -7.3%    |
Mean performance of all activities                                                          | 63.8% | 67.6% | 6.0%     |
## Organizational contributions to foundational activities, 1998-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Organization</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local public health agencies</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other local government agencies</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State public health agencies</td>
<td>46.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>-25.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other state government agencies</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>-28.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal government agencies</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician practices</td>
<td>20.2%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>-10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community health centers</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>134.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health insurers</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employers/businesses</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>-9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
<td>-17.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Universities/colleges</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organizations</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>-9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other nonprofit organizations</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>-38.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Equity in public health delivery systems
Implementation of foundational activities

Health effects attributable to multi-sector work

Impact of Comprehensive Systems on **Mortality**, 1998-2014

Fixed-effects instrumental variables estimates controlling for racial composition, unemployment, health insurance coverage, educational attainment, age composition, and state and year fixed effects.  N=1019 community-years

Mays GP et al. *Health Affairs* 2016
Economic effects attributable to multi-sector work

Impact of Comprehensive Systems on Medical Spending (Medicare) 1998-2014

Models also control for racial composition, unemployment, health insurance coverage, educational attainment, age composition, and state and year fixed effects. N=1019 community-years. Vertical lines are 95% confidence intervals.

Mays GP et al. *Health Services Research* 2017
Economic effects attributable to multi-sector work

Impact of Comprehensive Systems on Life Expectancy by Income (Chetty), 2001-2014

Models also control for racial composition, unemployment, health insurance coverage, educational attainment, age composition, and state and year fixed effects. N=1019 community-years. Vertical lines are 95% confidence intervals.

Mays GP et al. forthcoming 2017
Conclusions and implications

- Large health gains accrue to comprehensive systems
- Health gains are larger for low-income populations and low-income communities
- Dense collaborative networks do more than just plan: prioritize, invest, evaluate, repeat (crowd-sourcing)
- Equity and opportunity: two-thirds of communities currently lack comprehensive systems
- ACA incentives and resources may help:
  - Hospital community benefit
  - Value-based health care payments
  - Insurer and employer incentives
  - Public health agency accreditation
- Sustainability and resiliency are not automatic
Finding the connections

- Act on aligned incentives
- Exploit the disruptive policy environment
- Innovate, prototype, study – then scale
- Pay careful attention to shared governance, decision-making, and financing structures
- Demonstrate value and accountability to the public
Our research program focuses on delivery and financing system alignment.

http://www.systemsforaction.org
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