Session 1: The Social Determinants of Health

Social determinants of health are societal, economic, and environmental factors that influence health but are, in some respects, outside the control of the health system.

→ **Many factors combine to affect the health of individuals and communities.** There is growing recognition that a broad range of social, economic, and environmental factors shape individuals’ opportunities and barriers to engage in healthy behaviors. While health care is essential to maintaining good health, research shows that health care alone is not a strong determinant of health outcomes. Despite annual health care expenditures projected to exceed $3 trillion, health outcomes in the United States continue to fall behind other developed countries. Although overall spending on social services and health care in the United States is comparable to other Western countries, the United States spends disproportionately less on social services and more on health care.

→ **Social determinants have a significant impact on health outcomes.** Social determinants of health are “the structural determinants and conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age.” They include factors like socioeconomic status, education, the physical environment, employment, and social support networks, as well as access to health care.

→ **Housing is a key determinant of health.** Homelessness is a significant barrier to good health. Poor nutrition, inadequate hygiene, exposure to violence and weather-related illness and injury, increased risk of contracting communicable diseases, and the constant stress of housing instability all contribute to the health issues faced by homeless individuals and families. Without housing, simple cuts become infected, routine colds develop into pneumonia, and manageable chronic diseases such as hypertension, diabetes, and HIV become disabling, life-threatening, and costly conditions. Homeless persons die on average 30 years sooner than their housed counterparts.

→ **Violence has direct and indirect impacts on health.** The health consequences of violence can be immediate and acute, long-lasting and chronic, and/or fatal. In addition to the direct effects of physical injury, there can be indirect physical, mental, and emotional effects for victims and witnesses of violence. The observation of violence in childhood has been associated with higher levels of smoking, alcohol abuse, depression, and poorer health in adulthood. Common long-term health consequences of violence against women include chronic pain syndromes; sexual and reproductive health complications; and a greater risk of adverse mental and behavioral health outcomes, including depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder.

### Strategy #1: Invest in community health resources that complement the personal health activities of members

- Support efforts to increase consumer access to healthy options (ex: fresh food, exercise)
- Invest in preventative care, including school-based prevention models (ex: asthma, smoking)
→ **Personal health and community health are interconnected.** According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, working at the community level to promote healthy living and prevent chronic disease brings the greatest health benefits to the greatest number of people in need. Community health care can complement personal health activities and address the social, economic, and environmental factors that may serve as barriers to individual health and wellness.

→ **Addressing social determinants of health is important for achieving greater health equity.** The Department of Health and Human Services defines health disparities as “differences in health outcomes that are closely linked with social, economic, and environmental disadvantage.” This definition recognizes that health disparities are rooted in the social, economic, and environmental context in which people live. Achieving health equity will require addressing these social and environmental determinants through both broad population-based health care approaches and targeted health care approaches focused on communities experiencing the greatest disparities.

**Strategy #2:** Take a leadership role in establishing and building upon multi-sector partnerships, including social services, housing and health providers, to:
- Coordinate community health efforts
- Improve primary care delivery to individual/family members
- Invest in opening Family Resource Centers
- Engage consumers where they are and learn from their lived experiences

**Strategy #3:** Develop and utilize community-based care management teams (nurses, social workers, community health workers) to provide in-home care for high utilizers with physical and behavioral health needs
- Create a “health conductor” role to focus on addressing the social determinants of health with a focus on interventions, awareness, and changes that improve member health outcomes
- Provide behavioral health workers with training in strengths-based, trauma-informed care
- Facilitate connections to primary care providers
- Provide consumers with a bridge to telephonic care to manage health care needs

**Strategy #4:** Improve utilization of the Community Health Needs Assessment to identify and assess health needs for members, including the social determinants of health
- Broaden the definition of health in the Community Health Needs Assessment to more successfully bridge gaps across sectors and bring various partners on board
- Utilize funding from Community Health Needs Assessment to further investment in addressing social determinants of health
The Role of Health Care in Addressing the Social Determinants of Health

Two Models of Coordination to Address Population Health and Social Determinants of Health

The following visuals demonstrate two different models for structuring population health activities to address social determinants of health. Both take the form of a hub-and-spoke, where the hub allocates funding to and coordinates activities of spokes.

→ **In the health care-centric model**, health care organizations at the hub would contract or manage health promotion activities and social service delivery by purchasing or contracting for these services from community organizations, providing the services themselves, or some combination of these approaches. Health care organizations may be motivated to take on the hub role given the financial risk for outcomes in accountable care and the need to collaborate to achieve improved outcomes in social determinants. Health care organizations also have expertise in structuring and managing contractual relationships with service providers. Additionally, many health care organizations are expanding the focus of their organizations to address the overall health of consumers, including social determinants of health, rather than focusing exclusively on the provision of health care services. For health care providers, accomplishing this goal of addressing a broader definition of “health” may include widening care coordination efforts to include social services.

**Strategy #5:** Utilize a hub-and-spoke approach to address the Social Determinants of Health, centralized around Mayor’s Office and with spokes including Fire, EMT, Police Department, Department of Education, Housing Authority, etc.
The public health/philanthropy-centric model offers an alternative vision in which health care organizations would take on the role of a spoke alongside other community actors, leaving another organization to take up the hub position. In some communities, this coordinating role could be played by the local government. In other communities, cross-sector collaborations among a range of different organizations may be explored, with the potential for local foundations or organizations to take the lead in communities.

There is only one assumption you should make for every patient: Everybody wants to be healthy. We have started looking not just at who the patient is, but what conditions they return to at home.

We need to create environments that give people the capacity to be healthy. People cannot be healthy unless they are safe.”

- Kathleen Reeves, Senior Associate Dean of the Office of Health Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion at the Lewis Katz School of Medicine at Temple University
Both hub-and-spoke models are currently in practice in the United States:

- In Baltimore, Maryland, Bon Secours Health System has taken on a hub role to coordinate population health efforts, focusing on increasing the stock of affordable housing in its neighborhood and helping coordinate the efforts of other organizations to increase access to education, job training, and community activities.

- Nationwide Children’s Hospital in Columbus, Ohio has served as a hub organization in developing a Healthy Neighborhoods, Healthy Families network to address underlying health disparities in the Southside neighborhood adjacent to the hospital.

- In Spartanburg, South Carolina, a local family foundation, the Mary Black Foundation, has taken the lead in a large community health investment project, and has coordinated work among health care organizations, local government, non-profits, and local businesses to improve community health.

- Some local public health departments have used Affordable Care Act-mandated community health needs assessments as runways to longer-term collaboration among health systems and community partners.

Emerging Efforts to Integrate Social and Environmental Needs into the Health Care System

Strategy #6: Expand use of Medicaid to encompass housing as a health need
- Leverage Medicaid to pay for outreach and housing support services
- Maximize utilization of State Innovation Model (SIM) initiative to address social determinants of health

State Innovation Model Initiative: The State Innovation Models (SIM) Initiative is operated by the Center for Medicare & Medicaid Innovation and provides financial and technical support to states for the development and testing of state-led, multi-payer health care payment and service delivery models that will improve health system performance, increase quality of care, and decrease costs. Through the SIM Initiative, several states are engaged in multi-payer delivery and payment reforms that include a focus on population health and recognize the role of social determinants.

- The District of Columbia’s SIM Plan includes the short-term goal of implementing a second Medicaid health home benefit in D.C. (called Health Home 2 or HH2) where primary care providers coordinate and integrate care for high-need residents with certain chronic physical health conditions and social needs that impact health, such as homelessness. D.C.’s long-term goal is to systematically transition to a more cohesive, “whole person” approach to care that is underpinned by alternative methods of payment linked to outcomes.

- New York plans to use SIM funds to support the use of public health consultants who will work to spread evidence-based clinical initiatives to improve population health. They also will also help providers connect their patients to community and public health resources and services.
Connecticut’s SIM plan seeks to promote an advanced medical home model that will address the wide array of individuals’ needs, including environmental and socioeconomic factors that contribute to their ongoing health. Its plan also includes community health improvement efforts that will coordinate efforts across community organizations, providers, employers, consumers, and local public health entities.

Medicaid Delivery and Payment Reforms: Given Medicaid’s longstanding role serving a diverse population with complex needs, several Medicaid delivery and payment reform initiatives include a focus on linking health care and social needs.

- **Colorado** and **Oregon** are both implementing Medicaid payment and delivery models that provide care through regional entities. Coordinated care organizations (CCOs) in Oregon and regional care collaborative organizations (RCCOs) in Colorado focus on integration of physical, behavioral, and social services as well as community engagement and collaboration.

- **Medicaid programs** are addressing broader factors influencing health through the health homes option established by the Affordable Care Act. Health home services include comprehensive care management, care coordination, health promotion, comprehensive transitional care, patient and family support, and referrals to community and social support services.

Provider Efforts: Community health centers (CHCs) can play a key role in addressing social determinants of health given that they serve at-risk and underserved communities with broad needs. CHCs have a long history of meeting both the clinical and non-clinical needs of the patients they serve and collaborating with community and social support services.

“Coverage gains under the [Affordable Care Act] provided a strong foundation for moving beyond health care to improve health and advance health equity. This is a new avenue to connect with individuals and address their health needs.”

- Samantha Artiga, Director of the Disparities Policy Project at the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation and Associate Director for the Foundation’s Program on Medicaid and the Uninsured
The National Association for Community Health Centers, in partnership with the Association of Asian Pacific Community Health Organizations, the Oregon Primary Care Association, and the Institute for Alternative Futures, developed and launched the **Protocol for Responding to and Assessing Patients’ Assets, Risks, and Experiences** (PRAPARE), a tool to help health centers and other providers collect the data needed to address patients’ social determinants of health.²³

### Strategy #9: Utilize a standardized tool that can assess the demographics of communities and needs of members
- Adapt the Protocol for Responding to and Assessing Patients’ Assets, Risks, and Experiences (PRAPARE) to assess members for select social determinants of health
- Develop interventions for members based on assessment results

**→ Health Plan Efforts:** Given that social determinants have such a significant impact on health outcomes and health status, managed care plans have incentive to help their members address their broader needs. Some plans have developed specific programs or initiatives to address those needs.

- **In Los Angeles,** the LA Care Health Plan opened Family Resource Centers in underserved areas of Los Angeles County. The centers help enrollees understand their benefits and identify available providers. They also offer health screenings and free classes on topics such as parenting, asthma, and health management. For the broader community, they help individuals obtain health insurance coverage, provide free health classes, and connect individuals with community organizations and services.²⁴

### Strategy #10: Create more opportunities like the AmeriHealth Caritas Leadership Convening for cross-sector discussion and planning, supported by individual follow-up meetings
- Improve coordination of existing cross-sector convenings, task forces, and work groups to continue identifying strategies, move forward on action steps, and track progress
- Bring alternative partners to the table partners that might be willing to give back to the communities that they are impacting (ex: developers, businesses)
- Partner with local leaders to give voice to community needs

---
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Despite having significantly higher health spending than comparably wealthy and sizable countries, the U.S. lags behind in several measures of health outcomes:

**Life Expectancy**

Life expectancy at birth in years, 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Life Expectancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>83.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>82.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>82.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparable Country Average</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>81.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>80.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Mortality**

Age-adjusted major causes of mortality per 100,000 population, in years, 2010

Nationally, the life expectancy gap decreased by 2.2 years. In D.C., the life expectancy gap increased by 0.3 years.

**Disease Burden Rates**

Age standardized disability adjusted life year (DALY) rate per 100,000 population, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Disease Burden Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>11,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>10,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>10,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>9,860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>9,782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9,127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>9,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>9,392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparable Country Average</td>
<td>9,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>8,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>8,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>8,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>7,922</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Americans with lower incomes are less likely to report being in good health than those with high incomes. The least healthy American counties also tend to have higher rates of unemployment and lower graduation rates.
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