

The American College of Preventive Medicine Policy Recommendations on Public Health Funding

Andrew S. Karasick, MD, MBA, MPH,¹ Samuel Peik, MD, MPH²

The American College of Preventive Medicine Policy Committee makes policy guidelines and recommendations on Preventive Medicine and Public Health topics for Public Health decision makers. After a review of the current evidence available in 2016, the College is providing policy recommendations designed to inform public health investment. The American College of Preventive Medicine advocates for policies that recognize the health and economic value of public health funding and promote investment in these vital capabilities. Shortfalls in public health infrastructure, particularly workforce funding, must be corrected to ensure lasting benefits. Contingency funding for public health emergencies should be established and fully funded to adequately respond to emerging threats.

Am J Prev Med 2017;1(0):000-000. © 2017 American Journal of Preventive Medicine. Published by American Journal of Preventive Medicine. All rights reserved.

INTRODUCTION

The American College of Preventive Medicine (ACPM) Policy Committee makes policy guidelines and recommendations on Preventive Medicine and Public Health topics for Public Health decision makers. After a review of the current evidence available in 2016, the College is providing policy recommendations designed to inform public health investment. These recommendations aim to justify public health investment and to identify important targets for public health investment.

METHODS

The ACPM's Policy Committee, which is charged with recommending legislative initiatives and policy positions, developed these recommendations. The Committee reviewed available literature through May 2016 on health and economic ramifications of public health investment, as well as critical gaps for public health investment. The ACPM Prevention Practice Committee reviewed the draft recommendations, after which the Policy Committee considered it formally. The policy recommendations were approved by the ACPM Policy Committee on August 5, 2016, and by the ACPM Board of Regents on August 22, 2016.

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

The ACPM advocates for policies that recognize the health and economic value of public health funding and promote investment in these vital capabilities. Shortfalls in public health infrastructure, particularly workforce

funding, must be corrected to ensure lasting benefits. Contingency funding for public health emergencies should be established and fully funded to adequately respond to emerging threats.

Supporting Statements

- Public health investment is greatly beneficial to the health and wellness of the American people.
- Public health investment is a significant generator of productivity and economic value for the American economy.
- The economic value of public health investment is measurable and offers clear justification for increased public health funding.
- Shortfalls in public health infrastructure, particularly workforce funding, must be corrected to ensure lasting benefits.
- Contingency funding for public health emergencies should be established and fully funded to adequately respond to emerging threats.

From the ¹Department of Preventive Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland; and ²GlaxoSmithKline, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Address correspondence to: Andrew S. Karasick, MD, MBA, MPH, Department of Preventive Medicine, Johns Hopkins University, 615 N. Wolfe Street, WB602, Baltimore MD 21205. E-mail: andrew.karasick@gmail.com.

0749-3797/\$36.00

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2017.08.012>

Supporting Evidence

Public health investment is greatly beneficial to the health and wellness of the American people. Every year, millions of Americans are adversely affected by preventable illness and injury.¹ Over an extended period of time, public health interventions have significantly influenced a wide range of risk factors contributing to morbidity and mortality,² positioning many of these efforts as among the most important health interventions of the present time. These interventions have a broad impact and can be deployed in a variety of settings and contexts. For example, community-based interventions have been successfully employed to address many public health issues, such as obesity, asthma, communicable diseases, injury prevention, and substance abuse.³ In general, increasing public health funding improves corresponding health outcomes,⁴ and public health resources may additionally offset medical care needs by preventing or limiting disease and injury.⁵ Although disease treatment is unquestionably a key part of the healthcare landscape, prevention is often preferable. When given a choice between disease prevention and disease treatment, data suggest Americans tend to prefer prevention.⁶

Public health investment is a significant generator of productivity and economic value for the American economy. Investment in specific evidence-based community prevention programs can offer a greater than 5 to 1 return in decreasing costs associated with targeted morbidity,⁷ a number not easily replicated by other healthcare interventions. This has received significant attention from the business community through the implementation of health and wellness programs, and evidence suggests that when managed properly, these programs can offer multiple benefits.⁸ A recent review of multifactorial health promotion programs incorporating worksites suggests potential for clinical and cost effectiveness.⁹ Further studies show programs may provide benefit beyond medical cost savings alone, such as productivity improvement and improved job satisfaction.¹⁰ Interest also exists among small businesses in implementing worker wellness programs when offered financial and logistical support.¹¹

The economic value of public health investment is measurable and offers clear justification for increased public health funding. The value of health programs may be approached by quantitative measures. The development of calculators offers the ease of understanding value composition by stakeholders for funding purposes as well as for intervention planners; return on investment calculators have been developed by both private and governmental entities, such as the Center for Healthcare Strategies and the U.S. Army.^{12,13} These calculators have been used to help design new programs and assess

existing programs, including financial justification for a provider incentive initiative through Arizona's Medicaid program and a disease management initiative through Pennsylvania's Medicaid agency.¹⁴ Calculator adjustability has allowed for improvement via incorporation of stakeholder feedback,¹⁴ which enhances the value and flexibility of cost justification. Additionally, utilization of surrogate data (which may be more readily available) in place of direct outcome data (which often lags in time), may offer more timely justification for new or continued program funding,¹⁵ enhancing overall utility. Calculations incorporating employer-centric outcomes, such as worker turnover rate and absenteeism, provide additional input to the value of health promotion initiatives.¹⁶

Shortfalls in public health infrastructure, particularly workforce funding, must be corrected to ensure lasting benefits. Public health infrastructure to support public health initiatives, in the form of adequate workforce and informatics, are established objectives of the Healthy People 2020 Initiative by the Office of Disease Prevention and Health Promotion.¹⁷ Funding for public health infrastructure has recently been estimated to be less than half of the \$24 billion required to support core public health functions and to ensure that all communities have the minimum package of public health services.² An estimated need for 20,000 U.S. Public Health physicians suggested a necessary 100% increase from current workforce levels.¹⁸ An increase of >400 preventive medicine physician residents annually from recent levels is required to fill this gap.¹⁸ The ACPM believes that sustained public and private investment in such public health infrastructure will ensure that the health and economic benefits of public health continue to enrich the lives of all Americans.

Contingency funding for public health emergencies should be established and fully funded to adequately respond to emerging threats. Immediate Needs Funding is a designated fund available for the Federal Emergency Management Agency to disburse for emergency work that must be performed immediately and paid for within 60 days following a disaster declaration.¹⁹ An analogous fund specifically for public health disasters could abrogate potential delays for provision of vital supplies and services, to mitigate or prevent disaster-related morbidity and mortality. Although the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) Foundation's U.S. Emergency Response Fund offers limited assistance with addressing public health disasters,²⁰ recent funding requests by CDC to sufficiently respond to emergencies involving the Ebola²¹ and Zika²² viruses highlight the additional need for a designated contingency fund. Recent requests for public health disaster contingency funding are in the \$1.5–1.9 billion range.^{21,22}

متن کامل مقاله

دریافت فوری ←

ISIArticles

مرجع مقالات تخصصی ایران

- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه تمام متن مقالات انگلیسی
- ✓ امکان دانلود نسخه ترجمه شده مقالات
- ✓ پذیرش سفارش ترجمه تخصصی
- ✓ امکان جستجو در آرشیو جامعی از صدها موضوع و هزاران مقاله
- ✓ امکان دانلود رایگان ۲ صفحه اول هر مقاله
- ✓ امکان پرداخت اینترنتی با کلیه کارت های عضو شتاب
- ✓ دانلود فوری مقاله پس از پرداخت آنلاین
- ✓ پشتیبانی کامل خرید با بهره مندی از سیستم هوشمند رهگیری سفارشات