

# Tobacco Prevention Education Program Funding Formula Subcommittee



<b>Meeting Date:</b>	January 29, 2018
<b>Meeting Time:</b>	3:30 – 5:00
<b>Meeting Location:</b>	Room 1D
<b>Subcommittee Purpose:</b>	The purpose of the Tobacco Prevention Education Program (TPEP) Funding Formula Workgroup subcommittee is to collaborate, plan and provide suggested local TPEP funding scenarios to the TPEP funding formula workgroup.

## Attendees

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kirsten Aird, OHA-PHD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Danna Drum, OHA-PHD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Luci Longoria, OHA-PHD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Gwyn Ashcom, Washington	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Karen Girard, OHA-PHD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tanya Phillips, Jackson
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rachael Banks, Multnomah	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Julia Hesse, Clatsop	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ashley Thirstrup, OHA-PHD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Muriel DeLaVergne-Brown, Crook	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Kati Moseley, OHA-PHD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Tara Weston, OHA-PHD
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Lillian Shirley, OHA-PHD	

Agenda Item, objective and background information	Time
<b>1) Welcome and overview</b>	<b>3:30 – 3:40</b>
<p><u>Goals for subcommittee</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review revised scenarios A and B. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Continue discussion of merits and concerns of each scenario</li> <li>○ Clarify questions</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Prioritize one funding formula recommendation to bring back to the larger workgroup</li> <li>• Identify subcommittee members to co-facilitate discussion with TPEP Funding Formula Workgroup</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Discussion &amp; action steps:</b></p> <p>During the last meeting, three funding formula scenarios were discussed. The group requested that HPCDP run figures on Scenarios A and B, which have been prepared for today. The group wanted to have additional discussion on Scenario B after feedback was provided on the proposed ranges for Scenario B tracks. The packet of information provided to the group includes additional narrative on Scenario B.</p> <p>Luci: A productive discussion took place in the previous meeting. At the end of that meeting, there was a strong consensus around Scenario B. Discussion took place after the meeting that influenced the consensus, but it is important to honor discussion and progression to date to keep moving this work forward as timely as possible.</p> <p>Tanya: We were not comfortable moving forward with Scenario B as presented during the last meeting and wanted further discussion.</p> <p>Rachael: There is not alignment among all staff within my organization on the scenarios and I will work to get everyone on the same page.</p> <p>Muriel: How do these scenarios align with modernization? I would like to address that during today's discussion.</p>	
<b>2) Assure clarity on current formula and review revised scenarios</b>	<b>3:40 – 4:30</b>
<b>Facilitating Questions:</b>	

- Which formulas best align funding to outcomes and advancing health equity in Oregon?
- Which formulas align funding with modernization efforts?
- If funding amounts will change (increase or decrease), how do we ensure program components are right-sized?

**Discussion & action steps:**

Ashley provided an overview of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) best practices for comprehensive tobacco control programs (see handout), which HPCDP adheres to for allocating resources. Based on CDC recommendations for funding a comprehensive program, Oregon is funded at 20% of the recommended funding amount, which is considered “limited reach”. The group reviewed a draft scenario handout illustrating how the 62% distribution (\$9.3 million) for State and Community Interventions would ideally be allocated.

Gwyn: Are we required to adjust the funding formula for the next biennium? Why are we revisiting the funding formula?

Danna: About a year and a half ago, there was a conversation among CLHO and PHD about TPEP funding and allocations, due to the nearly \$4 million cut that the TPEP budget experienced. The formula hasn't been adjusted in almost 20 years and it is appropriate to look at alternative options, especially with the recent work done on accountability. This is a quality improvement process because we are not getting outcomes statewide with the current formula. When the current formula was put in place 20 years ago, there were no distinctions, for example, among equity and cultural competency across the state. This is no longer the case.

Gwyn: This draft scenario describing the 62% state and community interventions distribution is a decrease in the funding amount going to local public health authorities from \$7 million to \$3.7 million.

Lillian: We have been clear that the \$3.7 million is the funding formula.

Karen: The current TPEP funding formula, Scenario C, is a tiered funding formula based on population. The per biennium funding formula total is \$3.7 million. Additional funding is determined on a per capita basis and fluctuates based on recommendations from the Tobacco Reduction Advisory Committee (TRAC) and the need for the TPEP program to achieve outcomes. The \$7 million total that went to local public health authorities (LPHAs) in the current biennium was not originally recommended. CLHO and PHD agreed to support a \$7 million 2017-2019 biennium allocation to counties (the funding formula plus the additional per capita allocation) and agreed to examine accountability and outcomes for an improved funding formula going forward. We have evidence that outcomes are achieved by giving funding to those ready to advance policies. Because no reduction was made to counties for the 2017-2019 biennium, there were cuts to every other component of the program and little funding for needed training and technical assistance (TA). We have since received complaints from the counties regarding the lack of TA and the need for TA in order to help get to outcomes.

Gwyn: Foundational work, such as basic TPEP, needs to exist to be successful in competitive opportunities such as SPARC. There are also limitations on who can apply for those funds. For example, you must have a tobacco-free county policy in place.

Muriel: I am concerned about competitive opportunities and the eastern counties, due to the lack of capacity around grant writing. How do we ensure these opportunities are available everywhere?

Luci: We understand that there can be challenges with capacity to write grants. Scenario B allows each county to work in a track of work and allows right-sizing of the funding for the amount of work being done. It also allows counties to be nimble and move into a different track when ready. Track 2 is not

## Tobacco Prevention Education Program Funding Formula Subcommittee



competitive, and counties can demonstrate readiness and capacity and can quickly move into another track when the opportunity presents itself, rather than waiting for and competing in an RFP process.

Rachael: It is important to look at state and local system interaction. Sometimes it takes state movement to do tobacco work, because there is not capacity or political will at the local level. If some counties can pass policies, this helps the state policy momentum. State level policies protect all counties.

Ashley: I see this as an opportunity. We all agreed one and a half years ago to look at the funding formula. We started by developing accountability metrics and now we have an opportunity to make a change to the funding formula to get to stronger statewide outcomes.

Gwyn: What was the amount that was not funded during the current biennium due to level funding of LPHAs?

Karen: During the current biennium we funded RHECs through the TPEP budget at a very limited amount compared to previous funding levels. Training and TA was significantly reduced. There was no SRCH or SPArC funding. Three positions were not filled. Due to one-time funds available due to budget savings and reconciliation of tax revenues, we were able to add back one position and SPArC resources (see Tobacco Prevention and Education Program Budget Update for CLHO\_5.4.18 document).

Luci: For several biennia, we have discussed the need to update the funding formula to get to outcomes. Meanwhile, despite repeat reductions to the TPEP budget, no cuts have been made to LPHAs in anticipation of a right-sized funding formula. When determining the 2017-2019 budget, we made an agreement to not cut county funding amounts and fix the funding formula to get to outcomes for the 2019-2021 biennium. CLHO and OHA have facilitated this process to determine how to right size the funding formula. The process has now taken almost 18 months. It is imperative we move forward to not hold up the TPEP LPHA program element component of the financial assistance agreement for the next biennium.

Muriel: Monetarily, this could be a big hit to local programs depending on which track they fall in. We need to look at RHECs as well and ensure that they are functional, as this is not the case with every RHEC. It is important that the investment for RHECs or other organizations are also getting to outcomes.

Karen: Yes, and the state program is accountable, as well. We are holding all of ourselves accountable for these limited resources.

### **Scenario A:**

Danna: Scenario A clarification- The previous subcommittee meeting had used a combination of modernization and current funding formula. To stay consistent to the recommendations of PHAB, the current Scenario A figures have been run completely through the modernization formula.

Tanya: Where did the percentage breakdowns come from? Small counties see quite a reduction.

Danna: The percentages came from PHAB funding and the incentive subcommittee and they worked on developing the formula. CLHO provided feedback and PHAB made recommendations. TPEP did not change the PHAB percentages.

Muriel: The modernization formula was developed for new dollars, and not necessarily for existing funding.

Danna: Correct. There have been programs that have explored if the modernization formula would make sense for existing dollars. As of yet, none have adopted it.

Luci: A lot of work went into the development of the modernization funding formula, and we wanted to maintain consistency with the wisdom of the committee that developed the modernization formula.

There was not support for Scenario A.

**Scenario B- tracks:**

The group discussed the various tracks and the revisions made since the last meeting. Track 1 funding was increased to \$35k based on previous feedback. The funding range was also increased for track 2. HPCDP also included an estimation of the number of counties that would opt in to each track based on progress reporting.

Muriel: What if a bunch of counties applying to higher tracks and there is not enough money?

Luci: I would love to have that problem! If that occurs, we could make the case for expanded and additional resources.

Tanya: Is there \$3.7 million for this scenario?

Luci: This scenario provides an opportunity for counties to move to different tracks, and it would remove the need for competitive processes, like those for SPArC and SRCH. Those resources could be put into the tracks for LPHAs.

Ashley: We also thought about how we can incentivize authentic community partnerships. This scenario allows counties to be nimble and potentially subcontract with community-based organizations to help with a strategy.

Julia: What happens if the tobacco tax goes through?

Karen: If a tobacco tax passed, we would see how the resources were allocated. It makes the pie bigger and we can point to how these resources would be used to achieve outcomes. Scenario B fits nicely to an influx of resources. If the tobacco tax went to the ballot, any tobacco tax dollars would not be received until the end of the biennium.

Rachael: Scenario B provides an opportunity to right-size where people are in terms of political will and readiness and doesn't penalize programs for something they don't have control over, such as political will. This scenario appears to take those things into consideration, as well as equity. I fully support looking at Scenario B.

Tanya: Medium size counties are going to need full time staff. When I look at the amount of funding, I am concerned.

Luci: I appreciate specific input to inform this range. In developing the range HPCDP estimated associated cost for a staff person in the track 2 range, as well as some supervisor time, at the top of the range.

Kirsten: Scenario B allows for flexibility of cross jurisdictional collaboration versus solely a county focus, and an opportunity to do things in a new way, such as with modernization. Scenario B brings up a different way to do business.

Tobacco Prevention Education Program  
Funding Formula Subcommittee



Muriel: When trying to get local policy, LPHAs are really trying to get in front of their local commission and don't want staff from another county telling them what to do.

Danna: Agreed. Some collaboration can happen if working on a certain priority but there is also a need to do some of the work in a specific county, as well. It is not just either or.

Gwyn: Is see that track 3 indicates that public health must be accredited. Is that at the time of the application?

Ashley: The accreditation language was incorporated into track 3 based on feedback from the previous subcommittee conversation.

Luci: Accreditation is a tangible way to determine alignment with the capability expectation for modernization, so it lessens discretion determining which track a county is in.

Tanya: I recommend putting public health accreditation in track 2 as well, but not making it a requirement.

**3) Decide on the funding formula recommendation to bring back to the larger workgroup**

**4:30 – 4:45**

**Facilitating Questions:**

- Which formulas result in more effective, accountable, and innovative approach to improve efficiencies and outcomes?
- Which formula best positions the entire state to advance policy and systems change to reduce tobacco use and reduce tobacco-related inequities?

**Discussion & action steps:**

Tanya: I am still more interested in Scenario B as this would make the pie bigger, but I am still concerned with the funding amount and if there enough money.

Rachael: I like Scenario B.

Muriel: I am a little nervous, but I think Scenario B is at least something we could take to the larger workgroup to talk about and decide. I would like to continue to discuss. For example, if a county chooses track 1, how do we help them rise up to get to a better place in the future to advance policy?

Julie: I am leaning toward Scenario B with similar concerns to Tanya and Muriel. I love the capacity building aspect to leave the door open for those that are ready to move to the next track. I do wonder what would happen with SPArC grants with this Scenario, as SPArC gave our county such a boost.

Gwyn: I need time to process and digest the information, so I am abstaining from a decision on a recommendation.

Danna: Lillian says we aren't getting the outcomes we need so we need to do something different. Remember that if we make a change and it doesn't work, we can look at making a different change.

**4) Closing and next steps**

**4:45 – 5:00**

1. Identify work to do before next meeting.

2. Identify communication needs.
3. Identify goals of next funding formula workgroup.
4. Other

**Discussion & action steps:**

The group determined Scenario B holds the most promise to bring forward to the larger workgroup. During the larger workgroup meeting, questions and concerns that were raised during the subcommittee meetings will also be discussed.

Tanya: It is important to really look at the numbers behind each of the tracks in Scenario B and put counties in a position to actually do the required TPEP work. I want the larger workgroup to see Scenarios A and C as well, as they all have to make the decision on the funding formula and need to understand what was considered.

Luci: It is important that we all help provide context to the larger workgroup about what led us to the decision to focus more on Scenario B - rightsizing the funding amount for the amount of work, getting to outcomes and allowing counties to be nimble in moving between tracks when they are ready to do so.

Muriel: We need more discussion on how this scenario plays out across the state with the dollars. There is not a unanimous decision on Scenario B, but we can move forward with further conversation with the larger group.

Danna: At the larger workgroup meeting, we can present Scenario B with an estimate of anticipated number of counties in each track to see how the funding might actually be allocated across the three tracks.