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Definition of shared services

"SHARING OF RESOURCES [SUCH AS STAFFING OR EQUIPMENT OR FUNDS] ON AN ONGOING BASIS. The resources could be shared to support programs (like a joint WIC or environmental health program) or organizational functions (such as human resources or information technology)."

The basis for resource sharing as defined here can be formal (a contract or other written agreement) or informal (a mutual understanding or "handshake" agreement).

Methods

Study Advisory Team Reviewed 2012 Survey

Cross-Sectional Survey of ALL LHDs conducted 4/17-5/20 (n=91)

Reminder: (Two Emails and One phone call)

External Events

Ebola, Influenza, Budgets, Holidays

Third Email Reminder (1/28/2015)

Survey Closed (3/2/2015)

Principal Findings

Governing Body Approval

Type of Service

- Another LHD provides funds, services
- Our LHD provides funds, services
- Our LHD shares equipment with another LHD
- Our LHD shares staff with another LHD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Service</th>
<th>Emergency Preparedness</th>
<th>Environmental Health</th>
<th>Other than Inspection &amp; Licensing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>39% (n=63)</td>
<td>48% (n=78)</td>
<td>24% (n=38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28% (n=45)</td>
<td>56% (n=91)</td>
<td>22% (n=35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22% (n=36)</td>
<td>41% (n=69)</td>
<td>33% (n=53)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governing Body Approval

- Approve some arrangements 48% (n=30)
- Approve all arrangements 35% (n=22)
- Never approve arrangements 11% (n=7)
- Do not know 5% (n=3)

Governing Type

- Governance type (non-LHDs) among LHDs that currently share services

- 73% (n=48) 29% (n=18)
- 63% (n=38) 37% (n=22)
- 80% (n=48) 20% (n=12)
- 71% (n=42) 29% (n=18)

Outcomes of Shared Service Arrangements: Examples

- "This agreement has decreased the workforce of a single department and increased program capacity."
- "The agreement provides us with a level of expertise we would not be able to recreate using existing staff."
- "By sharing services with County X in our WIC program, we provide consistent services between our two counties, have been able to recruit and support our staff, as greater client number provides greater funding."
- "We have a higher rate of inspections, increased quality of inspections and increased awareness of program to community."
- "Sharing equipment accomplished our goal of saving money."

Conclusion

- There is widespread use of SSA among local health departments in Wisconsin
- Many respondents express interest in continuing current SSA and in development of new SSA
- Making better use of resources and providing better services are primary motivators
- Evidence is needed to support administrators’ perceptions of gains to service effectiveness and efficiency