

Connecticut Health Gaps Report

What's driving health differences across the state and how can those gaps be closed?



Every year, **nearly 1,100 deaths in Connecticut could be avoided** if all residents in the state had a fair chance to be healthy.

If residents of all counties in Connecticut had the same opportunities for health, there could be:

80,000 fewer adult smokers

130,000 fewer adults who are obese

61,000 fewer adults who drink excessively

107,000 fewer people who are uninsured

58,000 more adults, ages 25-44, with some education beyond high school

20,000 fewer people who are unemployed

59,000 fewer children in poverty

6,300 fewer violent crimes

88,000 fewer households with severe housing problems

Introduction

Why is there so much difference in the health of residents in one county compared to other counties in the same state? In this report, the *County Health Rankings & Roadmaps* program explores how wide gaps are throughout Connecticut and what is driving those differences.

This information can help Connecticut state leaders as they identify ways for everyone to have a fair chance to lead the healthiest life possible. Specifically, this document can help state leaders understand:

1. What health gaps are and why they matter
2. The size and nature of the health gaps among counties within Connecticut
3. What factors are influencing the health of residents, and
4. What state and local communities can do to address health gaps.

What are health gaps and why do they matter?

As a country, we have achieved significant health improvements over the past century. We have benefited from progress in automobile safety, better workplace standards, good schools and medical clinics, and reductions in smoking or infectious diseases. But when you look closer, within each state across the country—including Connecticut—there are significant differences in health outcomes according to where people live, learn, work, and play. It is clear that not all Americans have the means and opportunity to be their healthiest.

Gaps in length and quality of life. Residents in one county are more likely to die prematurely or not be as healthy as residents in another county in the same state if they do not have the same kinds of opportunities to be their healthiest.

Gaps in the factors that influence health. Health is influenced by every aspect of how and where we live. Access to affordable housing, safe neighborhoods, job training programs and quality early childhood education are examples of important changes that can put people on a path to a healthier life even more than access to medical care. But access to these opportunities varies county to county. This limits choices and makes it hard to be healthy.

Poor health disproportionately burdens people who live in places that limit opportunities to live long and well. These gaps in health outcomes are costly and preventable. Gaps in health could be narrowed, if not eliminated, if we took steps to create more equitable opportunities. Improving education in counties that need it most is one example. That step and others can lead to higher incomes and more lifetime stability.




Giving everyone a fair chance to be healthy does not necessarily mean offering everyone the same resources to be healthy, but rather offering people specific resources necessary for their good health. For example, consider three children of different heights. Offering them all the same size bench to stand on would mean that shorter children do not have a fair chance to see over the wall. Offering each child a bench to stand on that is the right size for their height gives all children a fair chance to see over the wall.

Health gaps can exist in many dimensions—for residents across neighboring county lines, or between various groups within a community according to race, ethnicity, age, income, education or sexual orientation, among others. For this report, we focus on the gaps in opportunities for health that exist between counties within Connecticut, and provide strategies to address factors that influence these differences.




How big are the gaps in health outcomes between counties within Connecticut?

Every year, **nearly 1,100 deaths in Connecticut could be avoided** if all residents in the state had a fair chance to be healthy.



Percent of deaths in excess



Population size



Most of Connecticut's 1,100 excess deaths tend to occur in counties with higher populations (such as New Haven). However, some counties with smaller populations also have a disproportionate share of avoidable lives lost. For example, over 21 percent of premature deaths in Windham County could be avoided if Windham residents had the opportunities of those in healthier counties in their region.

Of course, population size is not the only factor that state leaders should take into account when selecting strategies to solve health gaps. We know that there are many factors that shape health. The next page of this report highlights factors state leaders may want to pay particular attention to as they work to improve health for all.

What do gaps in opportunities for health mean for people in Connecticut?

If residents of all counties in Connecticut had the same opportunities for health,* there could be:

- 80,000 fewer adult smokers
- 130,000 fewer adults who are obese
- 61,000 fewer adults who drink excessively
- 107,000 fewer people who are uninsured
- 58,000 more adults, ages 25-44, with some education beyond high school
- 20,000 fewer people who are unemployed
- 59,000 fewer children in poverty
- 6,300 fewer violent crimes
- 88,000 fewer households with severe housing problems


* see page 6

Highlighted health gaps in Connecticut

Highlighted measures (→) indicate *meaningful gaps* that policymakers and leaders may want to examine more closely. We define *meaningful gaps* as those that are noteworthy or statistically different from a state or U.S. value for factors that have the greatest influence on health (e.g., social and economic factors have a greater influence than clinical care). The best and worst counties represent the top and bottom 10% of county-level values for a given measure in the state or the U.S., respectively.

HEALTH FACTORS	Best CT County	Worst CT County	CT Mean	Best US Counties
Health Behaviors				
Adult smoking: adults who are current smokers	12%	18%	15%	14%
Adult obesity: adults that report a BMI of 30 or more	20%	30%	24%	25%
Food environment index: access to healthy food and food insecurity	8.7	7.6	7.9	8.4
Physical inactivity: adults reporting no leisure-time physical activity	17%	24%	22%	20%
Access to exercise opportunities: adequate access to locations for physical activity	96%	87%	95%	92%
→ Excessive drinking: adults reporting binge or heavy drinking	17%	21%	19%	10%
Alcohol-impaired driving deaths: driving deaths with alcohol involvement	29%	39%	34%	14%
Sexually transmitted infections: newly diagnosed chlamydia cases per 100,000 population	122	464	364	138
Teen births: births per 1,000 females ages 15-19	6	26	20	20
Clinical Care				
Uninsured: population under age 65 without health insurance	7%	12%	11%	11%
Primary care physicians: ratio of population to primary care physicians	1,081:1	1,867:1	1,190:1	1,039:1
Dentists: ratio of population to dentists	1,049:1	2,400:1	1,285:1	1,362:1
Mental health providers: ratio of population to mental health providers	250:1	548:1	323:1	383:1
Preventable hospital stays: hospital stays for ambulatory-care sensitive conditions per 1,000 Medicare enrollees	51	65	57	41
Diabetic monitoring: diabetic Medicare enrollees, ages 65-75, that receive HbA1c monitoring	90%	82%	85%	90%
Mammography screening: female Medicare enrollees, ages 67-69, that receive mammography screening	70%	64%	67 %	71%

HEALTH FACTORS	Best CT County	Worst CT County	CT Mean	Best US Counties
Social & Economic Factors				
High school graduation: ninth-grade cohort that graduates in 4 years	94%	80%	85%	93%
Some college: adults ages 25-44 with some post-secondary education	73%	56%	67%	71%
→ Unemployment: population 16+ that are unemployed but seeking work	7%	9%	8%	4%
Children in poverty: children under age 18 living in poverty	7%	18%	15%	13%
→ Income inequality: ratio of 80 th /20 th percentile of income	3.8	5.8	5.0	3.7
Children in single-parent households: children that live in a household headed by a single parent	22%	37%	31%	20%
Social associations: social associations per 10,000 population	11	7	9	22
Violent crime: violent crime offenses per 100,000 population	111	406	279	59
Injury deaths: deaths due to injury per 100,000 population	42	56	52	50
Physical Environment				
Air pollution: average daily density ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$) of fine particulate matter (2.5)	10.3	10.7	10.5	9.5
Drinking water violations: population potentially exposed to water exceeding violation limit during past year	0%	3%	0%	0%
→ Severe housing problems: households with ≥ 1 of 4 housing problems: overcrowding, high housing costs, lack of kitchen or plumbing facilities	12%	22%	19%	9%
Driving alone to work: workforce that drives alone to work	73%	83%	79%	71%
Long commute - driving alone: among workers who commute in their car alone, those that commute more than 30 minutes	27%	42%	31%	15%



What can be done to help close gaps in Connecticut?

Here are some examples of evidence-informed strategies to improve the above highlighted health factors:

→ Alcohol and Drug Use (Excessive drinking)

- Alcohol excise tax Regularly adjust taxes levied for beer, wine, and liquor purchases
- Alcohol outlet density Reduce density of alcohol beverage outlets (i.e., places that sell alcohol) or limit increases in the density of such outlets via regulatory authority
- Alcohol screening and brief intervention Identify persons with harmful alcohol consumption before consequences become pronounced and motivate them to address their alcohol problems

→ Employment (Unemployment)

- Unemployment insurance Extend or raise the compensation provided to eligible, unemployed workers looking for jobs
- Vocational training for adults Support acquisition of job-specific skills through education, certification programs, or on-the-job training

→ Income (Income inequality)

- Earned income tax credits Look for ways to expand various earned income tax credits for low to moderate income working individuals and families
- Funding for child care subsidy Increase financial assistance to working parents or parents attending school to pay for center-based or certified in-home child care
- Living wage laws Establish locally or state mandated wages that are higher than federal minimum wage levels
- Paid family leave Provide employees with paid time off for circumstances such as a recent birth or adoption, a parent or spouse with a serious medical condition, or a sick child

→ Housing and Transit (Severe housing problems)

- Housing rehabilitation loans and grants Provide funding, primarily to low or median income families, to repair, improve, or modernize dwellings and remove health or safety hazards
- Low-income housing tax credits Provide funding via tax credits at the state and local level for the development costs of low income rental housing
- Mixed-use development Support a combination of land uses (e.g., residential, commercial, recreational) in development initiatives, often through zoning regulations
- Service-enriched housing Coordinate permanent, basic rental housing with social services available onsite or by referral, usually for low-income families, seniors and people with disabilities

Choosing strategies that work

Taking time to choose policies and programs that have been shown to work in real life and that are a good fit for your state will maximize the chances of success. Focusing on policy, systems, and environmental changes – or implementing programs in a broad, systematic way – can lead to the most substantial improvements over time.

The strategies listed above are among many resources in *What Works for Health*, a searchable database of policies or programs that have worked in other places or are recommended by unbiased experts.

Visit *What Works for Health* at countyhealthrankings.org/what-works-for-health for information on these and other strategies to improve health in Connecticut.



How have states and local communities taken action?

The approach to reducing health gaps is not 'one size fits all.' Each state and community has different assets and opportunities they can use.

Many communities across the U.S. are already addressing health gaps and building a Culture of Health. States and local communities have improved health by taking action and making changes. Just look at community revitalization efforts, the expansion of education programs that empower young people, and local and state economic development.

For more detailed tools and guidance on how to improve health for all, visit the *Roadmaps to Health Action Center*:
www.countyhealthrankings.org/roadmaps/action-center

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Culture of Health Prize

State and local efforts can harness the collective power of leaders, partners, and community members to provide everyone with opportunities for better health. The 2015 *RWJF Culture of Health Prize* winners are prime examples of making this a reality. Here are links to examples of how these communities are cultivating a shared belief in good health for all:

- [Bridgeport, Connecticut](#)
- [Bronx, New York](#)
- [Everett, Massachusetts](#)
- [Kansas City, Missouri](#)
- [Lawrence, Massachusetts](#)
- [Menominee Nation, Wisconsin](#)
- [Spartanburg County, South Carolina](#)
- [Waaswaaganing Anishinaabeg \(Lac du Flambeau Tribe\), Wisconsin](#)



About County Health Rankings & Roadmaps

The *County Health Rankings & Roadmaps* program brings actionable data and strategies to communities to make it easier for people to be healthy in their neighborhoods, schools, and workplaces. Ranking the health of nearly every county in the nation, the *County Health Rankings* illustrate **what we know** when it comes to what is keeping people healthy or making them sick. The *Roadmaps* show **what we can do** to create healthier places to live, learn, work, and play. The Robert Wood Johnson Foundation (RWJF) collaborates with the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute (UWPHI) to bring this program to cities, counties, and states across the nation.

Visit the *County Health Rankings & Roadmaps* website at www.countyhealthrankings.org to learn more about the *Rankings*, the health gaps for each state, and how you can take action in your community.



County Health Rankings model © 2014 UWPHI

How did we measure excess deaths?

Excess deaths were estimated using two measures: population size and the difference in premature mortality risk between the county's age-adjusted mortality rate and the rate for the top performing 10% of counties within each state or region (for states with fewer, less populated counties). Premature deaths were considered those that occurred before the age of 75. Mortality rates were calculated using [CDC WONDER](#) data for 2011-2013. For each county, we examined the difference in mortality rates and then applied this risk difference to the county's population to estimate the number of excess deaths. To estimate the total for each state, the number of excess deaths was tallied for each county within the state.

This approach considers both the magnitude of the gap in mortality rates and the population living with that rate. So, if two communities had the same mortality risk gap, more excess deaths would be observed in the community with the larger population. Similarly, if two communities had the same population size, more excess deaths would be observed in the community with the greatest gap in mortality risk.

How did we identify health factors to improve?

County Health Rankings data can help to identify factors with meaningful differences across counties. Accounting for the relative influence of various factors on health outcomes, a range of techniques were used to identify those factors that seem to have the greatest potential opportunity for improvement. We identified measures where there are meaningful differences between the state's or poor performing counties' value and that of a U.S. or state reference value for the factor. Meaningful differences indicate that for a given state, the magnitude of the difference is consequential and/or statistically significant compared to this reference value.

Credits

Lead authors

Bridget Catlin, PhD, MHSA, Marjory Givens, PhD, MSPH, Julie Willems Van Dijk, PhD, RN

This publication would not have been possible without the following contributions:

Research Assistance

- Alison Bergum, MPA
- Kathryn Hatchell
- Amanda Jovaag, MS
- Hyojun Park, MS
- Elizabeth Pollock
- Matthew Rodock, MPH

Outreach Assistance

- Mary Bennett, MFA
- Kitty Jerome, MA
- Stephanie Johnson, MSW
- Jan O'Neill, MPA

Communications and Website Development

- Burness
- Forum One

Recommended citation

University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute. *County Health Rankings* Health Gaps Report 2015.

Data

- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention: National Center for Health Statistics
- Dartmouth Institute for Health Policy & Clinical Practice

Robert Wood Johnson Foundation

- Abbey Cofsky, MPH
- Andrea Ducas, MPH
- Michelle Larkin, JD, MS, RN
- James Marks, MD, MPH
- Joe Marx
- Donald Schwarz, MD, MPH
- Amy Slonim, PhD
- Kathryn Wehr, MPH

Scientific Advisory Group

- Patrick Remington, MD, MPH, Chair
- Maureen Bisognano, MS
- Bridget Catlin, PhD, MHSA
- Tom Eckstein, MBA
- Elizabeth Mitchell
- C. Tracy Orleans, PhD
- Maggie Super Church, MSc, MCP
- Renée Canady, PhD, MPA
- Ana Diez Roux, MD, PhD
- Wayne Giles, MD, MS
- Ali Mokdad, PhD
- Steven Teutsch, MD, MPH

countyhealthrankings.org

