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Abstract Text:

Research Objective: Few published studies have examined the degree of primary care (PC) and public health (PH) integration from both perspectives nor the potential linkages between local integration, service delivery, and health outcomes. To advance the field, this study focused on three essential questions: What are the key factors for integration? How can we best characterize local jurisdictions in terms of their degree of integration? How does the degree of integration vary?

Study Design: Qualitative key informant interviews and a 38-item, quantitative, online survey, were conducted to measure collaboration factors from both the PC and PH perspectives at the local level. The relative contributions of selected survey questions were used to calculate collaboration scores for each local jurisdiction. Those scores were then used to classify each jurisdiction within a multi-dimensional model of integration. Descriptive statistics were generated for all survey variables. Regression models were used to examine the potential association between placement in the integration framework and selected health indicators, including childhood immunization rates, self-reported youth and adult smoking rates, and self-reported youth and adult physical activity rates.

Population Studied: PH and PC leaders were identified for all 241 local health jurisdictions in four states: Minnesota, Colorado, Washington and Wisconsin. Forty paired key informant telephone interviews (representing ten matched leaders from five different jurisdictions in each state) were conducted using a standard protocol. Eighty percent of all local health directors across participating states completed the online survey (n=193). A parallel survey was administered to one or more PC leaders in all jurisdictions. The 31% primary care response rate (n=128) represents 50% of jurisdictions studied.

Principal Findings: Several key factors emerged as being necessary for successful collaboration. These factors sorted into Foundational and Energizing characteristics. Both PC and PH respondents generally agreed that foundational characteristics – such as mutual trust and respect, shared mission/vision, and basic communication -- were present in the current cross-sector working relationships. Respondents were less likely to agree that current relationships feature factors that promote sustainability (e.g., financial and staffing capability), clearly defined roles/responsibilities, or innovation. Overall, PH respondents were more likely to report the two highest levels of working together (e.g., 41% vs 26%). In general, PH respondents were slightly more satisfied with the working relationship (59% vs. 56%) and tended to report more ways in which they work with PC.

Conclusions: Leaders in both sectors value working together in principle, yet in practice, many report barriers and uncertainty about how to strengthen the foundation of the relationship, or to energize and sustain mutually beneficial relationships. Identifying shared priorities and achieving tangible benefits from working together – at the personal, organizational or population level -- may be especially critical to realize a long-term, sustained working relationships that result in measurable population health improvement.

Implications for Public Health Policy or Practice: Conceptualizing local PH and PC integration within a multi-dimensional framework provides key opportunities to target recommendations and action steps.
Few published studies have examined the degree of primary care (PC) and public health (PH) integration from both perspectives nor the potential linkages between local integration and service delivery, and health outcomes. To advance the field, this study focused on three essential questions: What are the key factors for integration? How can we best characterize local jurisdictions in terms of their degree of integration? How does the degree of integration vary?

### Background

The Institute of Medicine (IOM) makes a compelling case that increased integration of primary care and public health is crucial to population health, and the affordable Care Act incentives and expectations for such integration. Yet currently there is no consensus on terminology, definitions, or measures of integration between these two large, separate systems of care. To that end, researchers focused in primary care and public health practice-based research networks (PBRNs) from Colorado, Minnesota, Washington, and Wisconsin have come together to develop measures and use them to identify differences in integration at the local jurisdiction level; identify factors that facilitate or inhibit integration; and examine the relationship between extent of integration and services and selected health outcomes.

## Study Design

### Qualitative

Qualitative key informant interviews (n=40) and a 38-item, quantitative, online survey, were conducted to measure collaboration factors from both PH and PC perspectives at the local level. The relative contributions of each key question were used to calculate composite scores for each local jurisdiction. Those scores were then used to classify each jurisdiction within a multi-dimensional model of integration. Descriptive statistics were generated for all survey variables.

### Quantitative Response Profile:

**PH Respondents:** n=193 (80% response rate)

**PC Respondents:** n=128 (52% response rate)

**PH Dyads:** n=71 (29% of possible jurisdictions)

### Foundational Characteristics

**Key features of integration appear to exist in multiple dimensions:** Foundational characteristics and energizing characteristics.

### Relevance to Policy & Practice

Conceptualizing local PH and PC integration within a multi-dimensional framework provides key opportunities to target recommendations and action steps and help identify potential areas for growth.
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