

Tobacco Prevention Education Program Funding Formula Workgroup



Meeting Date:	February 19, 2019
Meeting Time:	2:00 – 3:30
Meeting Location:	Rm 1C
Workgroup Purpose:	The purpose of the Tobacco Prevention Education Program (TPEP) Funding Formula Workgroup is to collaborate, plan and provide suggested revisions to the local TPEP funding formula to ensure that the statewide investment is right-sized and administered in the most effective manner possible.

Local partner attendees

☒ Kirsten Aird, OHA-PHD	☒ Muriel DeLaVergne-Brown, Crook	☐ Rachel Peterson, Linn
☒ Julie Aalbers, Clackamas	☐ Danna Drum, OHA-PHD	☒ Tanya Phillips, Jackson
☒ Gwyn Ashcom, Washington	☒ Karen Girard, OHA-PHD	☐ Tim Noe, OHA-PHD
☐ Rachael Banks, Multnomah	☒ Julia Hesse, Clatsop	☒ Lillian Shirley, OHA-PHD
☒ C.A. Baskerville, Lane	☒ Luci Longoria, OHA-PHD	☒ Ashley Thirstrup, OHA-PHD
☐ Kerryann Bouska, Marion	☒ Kati Moseley, OHA-PHD	

Agenda Item, objective and background information	Time
1) Welcome Additional attendees: Inga Suneson (Marion County), Hilde Hinkel (OHA-PHD)	2:00 – 2:05
2) Meeting objectives overview <u>Review Goals for meeting 2</u> - Review work and recommendations of the subcommittee - Discuss Scenario B (see attachment) - Determine how to move forward TPEP Funding Formula recommended changes in preparation for the 2019-2021 biennium	2:05 – 2:10
Discussion & action steps: Ashley: Today we will review the work of the subcommittee, which met twice since the last workgroup meeting. No one had anything to add to the agenda.	
3) Overview of subcommittee process and preliminary recommendations - Subcommittee members will ground participants in the purpose and process of the subcommittee and the steps taken. - Subcommittee members will describe the funding scenarios, discussion and recommendation(s). - Workgroup will clarify any questions about the current TPEP funding formula. - Workgroup will review TPEP Funding Formula timeline and forthcoming deadlines. - Workgroup will identify remaining points of clarification and discussion.	2:10 – 2:30
Discussion & action steps: Ashley thanked the subcommittee for their work and collaboration on the funding formula and asked if anyone wanted to summarize the work and discussions.	

Tobacco Prevention Education Program Funding Formula Workgroup



Tanya described how the workgroup reviewed three scenarios. Group wanted to see funding numbers in each scenario. It became clear that in funding formulas A and C, all counties would see reductions. Scenario B was more appealing, because it would do away with the need for competitive funding, i.e., SPArC, by rolling SPArC funds into the B formula. Some counties agreed to move forward with considering funding formula B; Washington County did not make a vote for B or another scenario.

Ashley described scenario B, which is a tiered formula that includes three tracks. The nimbleness of this scenario eliminates the need for competitive funding like SPArC for counties that are in a high capacity implementation stage. Ashley reviewed the other scenarios as well as the group's process and some of the considerations the subcommittee worked through as they looked at each scenario. Ashley asked the subcommittee members if they would like to share their thoughts about where the group landed.

Tanya noted that scenario A is a modernization formula. This scenario describes how new dollars will be allocated if modernization funds become available. Muriel confirmed. Luci agreed that exploring the modernization funding formula as an option allowed us to explore a scenario that considers, for example, health status, mortality, limited English proficiency, and other factors embedded in modernization.

Ashley described some of the considerations and conversations in the subcommittee meeting that remained unanswered. Ongoing considerations include:

- Cross-jurisdictional and regional sharing – benefits and challenges or barriers.
- Incentivizing resourcing community-based partners, including tribes and culturally specific organizations; considerations about how rural communities do not always have as many organizations representing culturally specific populations.
- Parity: If a community applies for base funding, how do we ensure that all boats rise across Oregon, and all people have access to the same protections from the harms of tobacco? How can the accelerated track communities contribute to a statewide movement that helps all communities?
- If all communities apply to the accelerated track, will we have enough resources?
- Accreditation: Should it be a factor in the accelerated outcomes track? It's a tangible measure, but counties are in different places in the accreditation process.

Ashley reviewed the conversation that took place at the workgroup subcommittee about why we are discussing the funding formula at this time. TPEP is operating with nearly a \$4M budget gap from the previous biennium. The former cuts were a result of Tobacco Master Settlement Agreement funds being removed from the TPEP budget for allocation elsewhere. This resulted in OHA cutting training and technical assistance, staff, cessation supports, and data and evaluation. During our last budget conversation in Summer 2017, there was an agreement to maintain community funding at current levels, reduce funds at the state, and return to the conversation about accountability and statewide outcomes. We also agreed at this time to revisit the funding formula. This brings an opportunity to reduce disparities, align resources, and to get to outcomes.

A question was asked if TPEP funds are going to CCOs in the next biennium. Luci responded that there are no plans for that. The focus is on getting to outcomes. Partnerships are important for getting to those outcomes, and communities can come to decisions about who the fiscal entities will be.

4) Discussion of Scenario B

2:30 – 3:20

- Review Scenario B in detail
- Discuss Scenario B in context of achieving statewide tobacco prevention outcomes

Tobacco Prevention Education Program Funding Formula Workgroup

Facilitating Questions:

- 1) How can Scenario B expectations align with public health modernization measures?
- 2) What are your ideas for how Scenario B can result in more effective, accountable and innovative approaches to improve efficiencies?
- 3) How could Scenario B advance health equity in Oregon?
- 4) What are ideas for clarifying distinctions between tracks?
- 5) How can we measure success and effectiveness of the new funding formula?

Discussion & action steps:

Ashley reviewed the materials in the meeting packet.

The group discussed various considerations and questions around Scenario B that still need to be worked out in collaboration with CLHO, including:

- What would the criteria be for each track?
- Would tobacco-free county properties be required to enter certain tracks? This could be a barrier for some communities that might be able to get traction on other policies.
- Could there be movement between tracks, especially within the funding limits?
- Does the scenario let Track One programs “off the hook”?
- Would larger communities have reduced funding while also continuing to build capacity?
- How will rural counties be impacted by this formula?
- Could communities move between tracks during the biennium?
- What would cross-jurisdictional collaborations look like? Some regional collaborations might not make sense in some areas. What types of collaboration would make sense?
- Does the suggestion that the LPHA applying for the accredited be accredited make sense, given that counties are in various stages of the accreditation process?

Discussion summary:

Scenario B could allow flexible support for programs throughout the state that are ready for capacity building.

LPHAs would self-select into tracks through an application process for noncompetitive funds, administered through Program Element 13.

Julie commented that being able to move between tracks was helpful to Clackamas, which was funded equivalent to the “capacity building” level through current TPEP, then was able to access the “accelerated” track with SPARC funds. It could be helpful to not be pressured to be at the accelerated level until the political will is there, which can come and go suddenly. Scenario B seems to be an attempt to set up that structure.

The accelerated track would be expected to contribute to statewide tobacco prevention and policy movement.

The group acknowledged challenges with trust and a sense of fear, as well as a need to come to decisions within the upcoming deadlines. The group discussed the challenge of structuring funding to focus on outcomes and accountability while also working with decreased funds.

Clarification question: Are we required to come up with a new funding formula?

Karen answered that the funding formula can be whatever we as a group want it to be. We can use one of these scenarios or come up with another. We can also decide to do nothing and use the current funding formula.

Tobacco Prevention Education Program Funding Formula Workgroup



Kati encouraged the group to continue to stay grounded in the goals of TPEP: helping people not get addicted to tobacco and not be addicted for a lifetime. She reiterated the need to structure funds to get the best outcomes, whether we get more funding or become more under-resourced.

6) Closing and next steps

2:20 - 2:30

- Review process for sharing workgroup outcomes with CLHO Prevention and Health Promotion committee, full CLHO, and PHD leadership
- Identify next steps.

Discussion & action steps:

Ashley asked how the group would like to move forward.

- The group decided to dedicate the next CLHO Prevention and Health Promotion meeting to discussion of Scenario B.
- The hope is to bring a recommendation to the full CLHO meeting on March 21st.
- Muriel will also share updates with full CLHO on Thursday, February 21 and get feedback.