|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agenda** | | **Healthy Structures Meeting**  **March 23, 2015** | | | | | |
| **Facilitator:** Pat Crozier | | | | | | | |
| **ATTENDEES** | | | | | | | |
| Jan Kaplan  Danna Drum  Kathleen Johnson |  | | | **On phone:**  Pat Crozier  Pam Hutchinson  Claire Smith | | CA Baskerville  Karen Woods  Melissa Nye |  |
| **Meeting Objective(s):** | | | | | | | |
| **Agenda Topics** | | | **Lead** | | **Notes** | | |
| 1. Call to order, Roll Call and approval of previous meeting minutes | | | Pat | | * Review minutes-minutes will be sent out and reviewed and returned with any corrections. * Motion to approve will be at next meeting. | | |
| 1. Triennial Review QI Committee Update | | | Pat | | * Triennial Review meetings were facilitated by Matt Gilman * Discussed what drives the tool/program element and what is in the program elements * Questioned: should program elements be in the Triennial Review? * Trying to increase efficiencies * Programs that require an on-site visit, is it necessary? what are the requirements for an on-site visit? * Identified what is good about the current system that came from the survey that went out * Strengths and weaknesses of the Triennial Review * What works well and what areas need improvement? * There will be a discussion about future state at the next meeting on April 3rd * Timeline is to have something by June * There will be a proposal by the end of June * Identification of duplication of different tools across different programs * Distinct differences of counties that are far away * Discussed if Triennial Review is an appropriate time for relationship building, the larger counties didn’t think it was important, more of a checking in. * Discussion on what was the intention of the Triennial Review, a compliance visit * Question whether the Triennial Review as a form of an audit should be an opportunity for Technical Assist or relationship building * A question was asked if it had to be an on-site review and if there was a possibility of making it easier on state staff and the health department * There is a discussion of electronic submittal of materials * Make the information more accessible, look at reorganizing the materials * Ebook of what the historical Triennial Review report has been have some thoughts of reorganizing that report and make it more like an exit interview | | |
| 1. Review the Charter | | | Pat | | * Reviewed the history of the establishment of the charter * Healthy Structure Committee combined the former Funding and Standards Committees * Discussed how the new JLT Funding Task Group committee was established and went over its’ role * Background: * Approved by the Joint Leadership Team * Consists of PHD and CLHO * With funding cuts that are happening, this group was organized to communicate with the LPHD in case there are funding cuts federally, and cost allocation cuts. The Funding Task Force is looking at the high/totality level * Looking at the big system changes so that they can give direction if there is a big change * This group will review after 12 months and decide if it is beneficial and if they should continue * Creating joint understanding of how the system is funded. * What is the goal of having local health departments survive and how do you base some formulas around that? * What do we need in every county region? * Big conceptions in a very transformative stage * The role of this group may change around big changes of how to fund the whole system. * This group has only met 1x and has just started to do their work * Healthy Structure Committee will continue to review and make recommendation to CLHO on any changes to existing funding formulas and on formulas for new programs. * Healthy Structure Committee will continue to make recommendations to CLHO regarding new or changed Program Elements * HS Charter calls for work around the Minimum Standards for Local Public Health * Historically the Minimum Standards originally used as the basis for the grant funding that LHDs received from the state. * The statute was written in 1983 * No Financial Assistance Agreements at that time. LHDs received an annual grant based on agreeing to fulfill the Minimum Standards. * In 2002 State Public Health became a part of the State Department of Human Services. * As a Division of DHS funding changed from the grant process to the current FAA contract. * Minimum standards in use at that time morphed into program elements * This is why Program Elements have to be approved by CLHO * Objectives for Healthy Structures Committee * Review/recommendations regarding funding formula review process: * Leave the way it is and see what is happening with the modernization of public health question. * SWOC has included a lot of these recommendations * Pursuit of accreditation in support of the counties in having standards * How do the minimum standards that CLHO has produced line up with and get operationalized in relation to the modernization work? * Make recommendations for a standards review process * With the modernization bill that is focused on foundational capacities and capabilities as a foundation, how do the CLHO standards line up with where modernization may be going? Try to understand that so that CLHO can be informed. * Revisit this at the next meeting to discuss if keep the same or any changes need to be made. | | |
| 1. Complete SWOC Analysis Review | | | Pam | | * Recruitment of new members * When discussed, small and large representation,   9 county representatives (no set number)   * Inform CLHO that there are open spots?   + - Talk to Muriel about giving a pitch at the next CLHO meeting * Question: Do we need new/more members? * More participants are always welcome * Discussed the CLHO Healthy Structures Membership * If an increase in small county representation is wanted, this can be presented at the next CLHO meeting , leave as is and talk to CLHO * Put the question out to CLHO if more medium and small representatives are wanted * Onboarding for new members * Putting together a packet containing: * The Charter * Annual Report to CLHO about what has been done and what future agenda items are in the plan for the following year * Direction to the web to view the minutes from the past meetings * Overview of Local Public Health and the relationship with LPHD and CLHO * Understand the process of the committee and how to participate in a meaningful way * CLHO in the specific committee and what is its’ relationship to the larger CLHO * A diagram of all the committees and how they are related to CLHO * Create a “mock” packet and bring before the group for input * Jan Kaplan mentioned to the group about a packet that he created for Columbia County and will send it to Pat to look at as an example * Kathleen mentioned to the group about a packet that she also created for what is LPHA and an overview of Local Public Health and also about the responsibility of Local Public Health Authority * Encourage Local Public Health new members to view the web page * Work on a 1 pager to direct new members to the web page * Put something in the packet about the process of voting * Karen will draft a letter and send to the group for review * Meeting Management: * Post materials on the web page * Pat and Pam will post the materials * Administrative support * Minutes distribution * GoTo meeting, phone, in-person * Agenda & meeting distribution * Standing items: * Triennial Review QI * Workforce development * OCL report re: other communities * Standards Review Process * Something that the counties can actively work towards * Program Element & Funding Review Process * Review PE when reviewing funding formula * Evaluate of funding provided vs. work required * Understanding funding formula and changes * Funding Formula approvals do not go to JLT * Template that was used prior, look at it again and update to get a better idea of funding formula * Update the template and include the Program Element * Add this to the April Agenda * Understanding the topic areas * Timing for submission of proposal * PHD role & QI language * Describe the Local County Health Department Perspective * Principles & LHD/CLHO roles in setting the Funding Formula * Webmaster for committee page * Erin has volunteered * Pat, Erin and Pam will work out a plan for going forward * Performance Metrics-tracking statewide * In reference to a long term goal with all of the health departments in the state, tracking what people are doing with performance measures with the triennial review process * Accreditation process * Potential long term objective/goal * Workforce development competencies | | |
| 1. Committee Member Roles | | |  | | * Content, expertise * Representatives should include public health administrators and public health managers with specific content expertise. | | |
| 1. Action items and agenda items for next months meeting | | |  | | * Create a “mock” packet and bring to Healthy Structures meeting next month * Jan Kaplan will send to Pat the packet that he created for Columbia County as an example * Karen will create/review draft welcome letter * Webmaster for committee page * Erin has volunteered * Pat, Erin and Pam will work out a plan for going forward * Look at the wording and objectives that were worked out with SWOC and come back to the next meeting with something more reasonable * Review the Charter * Bring template for funding   Review OHA process for contracting with counties   * Discuss leadership funding committee update | | |

\*Send Draft meetings to Pam & Pat and after review, post on web after any corrections have been made

\*Send out agenda with appointment

\*Next meeting April 27th, 3:00-4:30 PM