

State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup

Date: 12/07/06

Present: Caroline Cruz, Mike Ponder, Betty Merritt, Andrea Tyler, Geralyn Brennan, Roy Gabriel – Chair, Karen Wheeler, Bill Etter, Shane Lopez-Johnston, Stephanie Soares Pump, Rey Agullana, Jeff Ruscoe, Matthew Tschabold, Tony Biglan, Martin Hankins, Gina Nikkel,

By Phone: Dennis Deck and Joyce Grant-Worley

Meeting Title: Monthly SEOW meeting

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
Review of Minutes	Roy opened the meeting with introductions.			
Beer & Wine Tax Discussion – Stephanie, Debra, Gina	<p>There’s a lot of interest in passing a beer and wine tax bill this session. In other states increasing alcohol prices through taxes has been shown to reduce alcohol use especially for the underage population. However, taxes have to keep up with inflation. To be effective, the tax has to keep prices high enough to discourage excessive use. Oregon’s present tax is quite low. The Governor’s Council was asked to suggest outcomes that can be included in the beer and wine tax bill over the next 5 years. Stephanie brought the request to the SEOW to discuss. The group was uncomfortable with identifying specific outcomes because the proposed bill, as it is currently written, would distribute funds equally to a number of agencies and departments. The funds would not be tied to performance and not necessarily to alcohol-related issues.</p> <p>The conversation was lengthy, covering many factors that come into play in order to demonstrate successful outcomes. Although the conversation wasn’t linear, the following summary has been organized into a few concepts that may help in crafting an effective bill:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data; • Implementing what works; • Oversight and assessment; and • Outcomes. <p><i>Data</i></p> <p>The SEOW is focused on statewide data trends. Roy pointed out that there are plenty of baseline data if the interest is in looking at statewide change. However, there are many gaps that will hamper the ability of AMH to assess the impact of prevention</p>	Summarize and share the key points of the SEOW discussion regarding outcomes and the beer and wine tax bill with the Governor’s Council and DHS management.	Stephanie, Debra, Gina, Karen	

State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
	<p>efforts.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oregon Healthy Teen survey results are analyzed by gender, race/ethnicity and geography. Annual results allow us to see which counties are doing better and which are doing worse, so this could be used to track where improvements are happening for youth in grades 8 and 11. However, youth are drinking at younger and younger ages and data is needed for grade 6. Also, schools are not required to participate, limiting our ability to assess efforts in those geographic areas. • At this time data for 18 to 21 year olds is inadequate and this is a critical age category needed to assess the impact of this bill on underage use. College students are not surveyed at all and they are a very high-risk population. A survey on college campuses would be very helpful. • The state has very limited adult data. It collects information on just a few alcohol-related items. The current adult survey sample is too small to analyze by race/ethnicity or geography. <p><i>Implementing what works</i></p> <p>Currently counties receive addiction prevention and treatment allocations based on “prevalence, population and formula” there are no financial incentives for implementing evidence-based programs. The proposed beer and wine tax bill, in its current state would continue to distribute funds in a similar manner. If outcome requirements were to be written into the bill, it would make sense for the funds to tie to performance, more to those who are achieving outcomes.</p> <p>Additional revenues resulting from this bill could serve as the engine that drives the implementation of SB267 by paying more for implementing proven programs and by dedicating funds to the development of a partnership between the State, Universities and Research Entities in Oregon, a Center for Prevention Excellence.</p> <p>After the passage of SB 267, it became apparent that there are a</p>			

State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
	<p>number of voids in the research about what works. This bill could improve the effectiveness of prevention and treatment efforts by funding a Center for Prevention Excellence that would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effectively link addiction professionals throughout the state with renowned experts in Oregon • Conduct research into effective programs for minorities and targeted populations such as girls, pregnant women, college students, etc. • Monitor and assess program outcomes. • Provide workforce development in prevention and treatment and increase the number of certified prevention professionals. <p><i>Oversight and assessment strategies</i> Over the last ten years, there has been considerable erosion of staffing in AMH. If we are to move towards outcomes-based prevention, there needs to be enough staff to do the planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation of state strategies as well as supporting local efforts. This means providing adequate staffing so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progress of state initiatives can be tracked and assessed. • County (and some community) data is up-to-date and readily available. • Specialized technical assistance is available for minorities and other targeted populations. <p><i>Outcomes</i> The initial request was to identify some reasonable outcomes to include in the bill. The SEOW was reluctant to offer specific outcomes not knowing what the final bill would say. As a result, the SEOW conversation led to the realization that the bill will have to support development of state-level prevention and treatment infrastructure including new mandates to ensure that fund allocations are linked to implementation of evidence-based programs and participation in surveys rather than just increasing the number of local programs. If this were to</p>			

State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
	<p>happen, it may be possible to report statewide outcome data consistent with the National Outcome Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current alcohol use by youth and adults, • Binge alcohol use by youth and adults, • Heavy use by adults, • Drinking and driving, and • Perceptions of risk of harm for youth only. <p><i>(HANDOUTS: 10 Drug and Alcohol Policies that Will Save Lives; Fact Book on State Beer Taxes; Helping Adolescents at Risk)</i></p>			
<p>Alcohol Profile and Priorities - GERALYN</p>	<p>The group did a quick review of the updated alcohol profile. Generally, the document is looking pretty good. There were a number of suggestions for improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add more cues on the graphs so casual readers know what they're looking at. • Include confidence intervals where available. • Include OHT data on youth riding with someone who was drinking (parent or other adult) and driving • Add footnotes to explain how the data was averaged over three years (graphs and map). • Include definitions with the graphs so the reader doesn't have to look back to the beginning for them. • Include information about surveys: how they are done, when, etc. • Change YPLL graph on p.11 so that it reports YPLL per 100,000 people 65 and under. <p>The draft of the Prevention Priorities section only describes who the priority populations are but not what can be done. Caroline will draft a general description of what is and can be done for the priority populations in terms of the six prevention strategies.</p>	<p>Identify PRAMS data to replace birth certificate data on prenatal alcohol use.</p> <p>Add a vertical line to separate OHT and adult survey bars on charts.</p> <p>Put gender in title of graphs.</p> <p>Put definitions with graphs (current, binge, heavy).</p> <p>Add footnotes to explain where the data comes from.</p> <p>Footnote why those ages were chosen.</p> <p>Add OHT drinking and riding data.</p> <p>Add footnote to explain the 3-year average.</p> <p>Make sure all data is reported to tenths.</p> <p>Add a brief description</p>	<p>Geralyn and Lesa</p> <p>Geralyn</p>	

State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
		of the surveys. Six prevention strategies.	Caroline and GERALYN	
Fact Sheets - Roy, GERALYN	<p>The group discussed many, many possible fact sheets that would be useful during legislative session and as educational materials in general. They are intended to be simple and focused, a “few tight points: on one two-sided page including information on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prevalence data • Financial impact • What is being done/can be done <p>Fact sheets need to be copy tested before release to ensure the right message is being conveyed. The fact sheets will have a consistent format (branding) including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design and layout • Tag line • State logo and the scientists/organizations who helped <p>Following are potential topics for fact sheet development. One through five have been assigned. Underage drinking will be the test fact sheet using the template.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Underage drinking 2. Girls’ underage drinking 3. Methamphetamine prevention and treatment 4. Tobacco 5. Adolescent depression and suicidality 6. Kids with multi-problem use and what family interventions 7. Underage drinking and sexual behavior 8. Evidence based practices 9. Parental Involvement 10. Effect of price on underage use 11. Adolescent Marijuana Use 12. Enforcement-underage sales, DUII rates 13. Treatment-the unmet need 14. The cost of use and abuse-what the state spent on 	<p>Send fact sheet samples to Karen Tony and Mike</p> <p>Contract with someone to develop a template to serve as a model for fact sheets.</p> <p>Send relevant data to fact sheet developers</p> <p>Draft underage drinking fact sheet (#1)</p> <p>Draft girls’ underage drinking fact sheet (#2)</p> <p>Draft meth fact (#3)</p> <p>Draft depression and suicidality fact sheet (#5)</p> <p>Draft tobacco fact sheet (#4)</p>	<p>GERALYN</p> <p>Karen, Tony, Mike</p> <p>GERALYN</p> <p>Jeff, Tony</p> <p>Jeff, Lesa Dixon-Gray, Pam Patton</p> <p>Claudia, Lawrence, Kaleen Deatherage</p> <p>Tony, Joyce, Lisa Millet</p> <p>Tony</p>	

State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
	<p style="text-align: center;">prevention years ago vs. now</p> <p>Renee sent the following link to Washington Fact Sheets. These are good examples of a branded, uniformly formatted fact sheet that we've been talking about.</p> <p>http://www3.doh.wa.gov/here/materials/CRA_Detail.aspx?ID=340</p>	<p>Test copy on fact sheets before release.</p>	<p>Jim Sellers</p>	
<p>Other information</p>	<p>Bill Etter shared an article about effective policy, <i>The Case for Lowering Legal BAC Levels Even More</i>. This article can be found at http://www.jointogether.org/news/features/2006/the-case-for-lowering-legal.html</p> <p>Geralyn did a PowerPoint presentation about the SEOW at the December Prevention Summit and distributed the slide handouts. Geralyn handed out preliminary data tables and summary of illicit drugs.</p>			