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Introduction
Objectives

To describe:

*Current partnerships* [at the time of the assessment] which make the IPP a successful collaborative program among STD, FP and PH Labs

*New partnership opportunities* which will be increasingly important to the sustainability of State and Family Planning Programs in a reformed healthcare landscape.
Methodology

- Secondary Data
- National & Regional KII
- Surveys
Survey Results – State Partners

State Partners: Does your agency have partnerships with...? (% responding formal or informal collaborations)

- Local Health Departments (N=122): 93.1%
- State Health Departments (N=120): 82.1%
- Community Health Centers (N=118): 76.3%
- Indian/Tribal/Urban Indian Health Programs (N=99): 38.9%
- Behavioral Health Facilities (N=100): 33.1%
- Private High Schools (N=102): 20.3%

Top 3: Local Health Departments, State Health Departments, and Community Health Centers
Bottom 3: Indian/Tribal/Urban Indian Health Programs, Behavioral Health Facilities, and Private High Schools
Survey Results – Clinic Partners

Clinic Partners: Does your agency have partnerships with the following? (% responding formal or informal collaborations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Partnership</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State health departments (N=624)</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV/AIDS service organizations (N=567)</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local health departments (N=562)</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Departments of Social Services (N=505)</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Departments of Education (N=487)</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian/Tribal/Urban Indian Health Programs (N=441)</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Top 3: State health departments, HIV/AIDS service organizations, Local health departments

Bottom 3: State Departments of Social Services, State Departments of Education, Indian/Tribal/Urban Indian Health Programs
A Regional Case Study

• HIV and STD Integration
  • Successes:
  • Resource sharing and realizing efficiencies
  • Data improvement
  • Bundled services
  • Reduction of duplication
  • Integrated messages

• Challenges:
  • Strategic planning
  • Chains of command
  • Overshadowing
  • Prevention vs. Service integration
  • Local level vs. Federal level integration
A Regional Case Study

- Developed a prioritized list of organizations to create partnerships and collaborations.
- Developed a communication outreach strategy to assist in networking with organizations working toward comparable goals
  - Help keep your patients on the right PATH
- Started to think strategically about current and new partnerships
Ideas for the Future

- Primary Care Providers and Associations
- Private Sector Providers
- FQHCs
- Schools, Academic Institutions, Departments of Education and School-Based Health Centers
- Federal/National Organizations
  - Office of Managed Care; Social Service programs; HRSA, Bureau of Primary Care; among others
Survey Results

Clinics: Is your agency involved in a patient-centered medical home model?

- Yes: 17.2% (FP N=216), 3.7% (STD N=61), 14.8% (FP & STD N=252)
- No: 86.2% (FP N=216), 68.0% (STD N=61), 61.9% (FP & STD N=252)
- I don't know: 20.7% (FP N=216), 20.7% (STD N=61), 20.7% (FP & STD N=252)
Conclusions
Conclusions

What Partnership Opportunities Do New Service Delivery Models Present?
Conclusions

• Potential role for sexual and reproductive health service delivery partners
  • Educating private / primary care providers
  • Marketing / messaging the benefits of collaborating with STD and FP program providers
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