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The Easy Question

Should all populations be covered by the same, high quality services and functions?
The Uncomfortable Questions

◆ We have about 2,500 LHDs in the U.S.
  ◆ Do we need 2,500?
  ◆ Can we afford 2,500?
  ◆ Can we imagine a day when all of them would meet accreditation standards on their own?
  ◆ Is it politically feasible to change the current LHD structure?

Adapted from: Gene W. Matthews, JD
Drivers

- National Public Health Standards
- Emergency Preparedness
- Increasing burden of chronic disease
- Foundational PH Services
- Lean fiscal environments
GOVERNANCE IS NOT NECESSARILY SYNOMOMOUS WITH OVERSIGHT
Two Critical Questions

◆ Who makes the decision to enter a CJS arrangement?
◆ What are the drivers behind deciding to engage in CJS?
DOB: May 2012

National initiative
- Managed by the Kansas Health Institute
- Funded by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

Goal:
- Explore, inform, track and disseminate learning about shared approaches to delivering public health services
◆ **Cross-jurisdictional sharing** is the **deliberate exercise** of public authority to **enable collaboration across jurisdictional boundaries** to deliver essential public health services.

◆ **Collaboration** means working across boundaries and in multi-organizational arrangements to solve problems that cannot be solved – or easily solved – by single organizations or jurisdictions.*

*Source: Rosemary O’Leary, School of Public Affairs and Administration, University of Kansas
## CJS Spectrum

### Spectrum of Cross-Jurisdictional Sharing Arrangements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As-Needed Assistance</th>
<th>Service-Related Arrangements</th>
<th>Shared Programs or Functions</th>
<th>Regionalization/Consolidation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information sharing</td>
<td>Service provision agreements (e.g., contract to provide immunization services)</td>
<td>Joint programs and services (e.g., shared HIV program)</td>
<td>New entity formed by merging existing local public health agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equipment sharing</td>
<td>Purchase of staff time (e.g., environmental health specialist)</td>
<td>Joint shared capacity (e.g., epidemiology, communications)</td>
<td>Consolidation of one or more local public health agencies into an existing local public health agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expertise sharing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistance for surge capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Looser Integration**

**Tighter Integration**

*Source: Center for Sharing Public Health Services. (2017).*
Our Questions

◆ Is CJS a viable option to improve effectiveness and efficiency of public health services?
◆ Does it work?
◆ Under what circumstances?
◆ Does CJS result in measurable improvements in efficiency and effectiveness?
◆ What makes a CJS project successful?
More Definitions

◆ **Effectiveness**: the ability of a public health program, service or function to achieve its desired results.

◆ **Efficiency**: getting the most out of the amount of resources needed to produce a given output or outcome.
Our Knowledge Development

◆ What is the practice in the field?
  ◆ Literature review, networking with national partners
  ◆ Demonstration sites
    ◆ Phase 1 and Phase 2
  ◆ Small grants
  ◆ Technical assistance
Does it Work?

- Initial evidence acquired was mostly case-specific and qualitative
- More recent systematic approach to measuring impact of CJS arrangements
- Our conclusion:
  - Under the right circumstances CJS can be a good tool
Improved Effectiveness

- Greater range of public health services and/or functional capacities available
- Improved quality of services
  - Timeliness
  - Accessibility
  - Professional level
- Ability to meet state or other performance standards (incl. accreditation)
Improved Efficiency

◆ Reduced costs – both overall costs and unit costs
◆ Greater productivity and economy of scale
◆ Ability to employ more robust and current service management systems
◆ Increased eligibility for state and federal grants
Striking the Right Balance

Efficiency  Effectiveness
Factors for Success

◆ Prerequisites:
  ◆ Take care of these before you even start planning

◆ Facilitating factors:
  ◆ Leverage them if they apply to your team and project

◆ Project characteristics:
  ◆ Build them in your project
Factors for Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A balanced approach (mutual advantages)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST!</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
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<td>A balanced approach (mutual advantages)</td>
<td>A sense of “regional” identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST!</td>
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## Factors for Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prerequisites</th>
<th>Facilitating factors</th>
<th>Project characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clarity of objectives</td>
<td>Success in prior collaborations</td>
<td>Senior-level support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A balanced approach (mutual advantages)</td>
<td>A sense of “regional” identity</td>
<td>Strong project management skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRUST!</td>
<td>Positive personal relationships</td>
<td>Strong change management plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Center for Sharing Public Health Services is a national initiative managed by the Kansas Health Institute with support from the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation.