

# PUBLIC HEALTH IMPROVEMENT PARTNERSHIP

## Foundational Public Health Services Policy Workgroup STATEWIDE ACCOUNTABILITY

### Introduction

As the FPHS Policy Workgroup moves closer to recommendations for an improved public health system, they have identified areas of risk that they want to better understand. A key concept in the Foundational Public Health Services (FPHS) framework is that the defined services are available across the state. The question inherent in this statement is: how do we ensure FPHS is implemented and maintained statewide?

One complexity of the question is how to determine appropriate accountability structures for both the state Department of Health (DOH) and Local Health Jurisdictions (LHJs). Additionally, some policy workgroup members representing LHJs worry about accepting funding from the state for FPHS because it may mean changes in local control and their level of accountability to outside entities about how that money is spent.

The purpose of this document, after we receive and incorporate Technical Workgroup input, is to help the Policy Workgroup better understand different options for how to hold DOH and local communities responsible for FPHS while preserving local control.

### Today's Conversation

Today, we want the Policy Workgroup to discuss:

- What are the challenges and benefits of different options for holding LHJs and DOH accountable for providing FPHS?
- Given that the legislature will want to ensure the funding is spent efficiently and effectively, what are some ways to ensure local control and flexibility while also demonstrating efficiency and effectiveness to the state Legislature?

### Ideas for Balancing Accountability and Local Control

#### **Who should DOH and LHJs be accountable to?**

One of the first questions around accountability is which organization should be holding the governmental public health network accountable for providing FPHS. Please provide your input on the following ideas:

- Assign the responsibility to the Public Health Improvement Partnership (PHIP)
- Develop an agreement between WSALPHO and DOH and assign responsibility to them jointly, with safeguards in place to avoid conflict of interest.
- Other?

**What principles should inform development of an accountability structure?**

The Policy Workgroup's vision may include statements about local control. Please be prepared to provide input on the following potential statements, including pros, cons, or suggested changes or additions:

- All entities included in the governmental public health network should agree that they will meet a minimum standard of providing FPHS using the funding allocated to them. Individual agreements with Tribal governments should include an accountability component.
- The Legislature has the right to expect that state foundational funds be used for foundational purposes, but should also acknowledge that it's appropriate to see significant variation in the way these services are organized and delivered in different communities across the state.
- Strong accountability for foundational funding is appropriate, but can and should be done in a way that does not interfere with the authority of the local board of health to determine priorities and approaches within the framework of foundational services.
- An accountability system should be developed and operated, with significant involvement by WSALPHO and DOH, to demonstrate how foundational funds are used by LHJs and DOH, and to assure that foundational funds are used by LHJs and DOH for foundational purposes.
- BARS should be restructured to facilitate foundational accountability for LHJs, and DOH budget reporting systems should also be aligned to allow reporting of FPHS activity.
- The accountability structure, and any reporting requirements, should take into consideration existing reporting and measurement activity that DOH and LHJs must complete to minimize the administrative burden on the governmental public health network.
- Other?