

Date: June 7, 2007

Time: 10 am - 12:30 pm

Meeting Title: State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup

Attendees: *Salem:* Roy Gabriel, Jessica van Diepen, Matthew Tschabold, Gina Nikkel, Geralyn Brennan, Stephanie Soares-Pump, Dagan Wright, Caroline Cruz, Rey Agullana, Michael Ponder, Jay Grussing, Shane Lopez-Johnson, Jon Collins *PSOB:* Joyce Grant-Worley, Stacey Schubert *Via Phone:* CA Baskerville, Tony Biglan

Next meeting: August 2 10:00-1:00
500 Summer St. Salem
Conference Room HSB 352

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
May minutes and old action items	<p>1.) Completed action items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Press release for Epi Profiles• AMH staff drafted suggestions for data gaps and a definition of community• ORI conducted a web meeting on Gematri, a web-based application for OHT• Mike Wilson confirmed that he will present at the August meeting• Rey set up quarterly meetings with TPEP staff <p>2.) Work is continuing on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• DHS communications is working on a fact sheet template• AMH staffs are organizing a 5 to 10 year strategic planning committee. An internal preliminary meeting will be scheduled first, followed by regional focus groups.	<p>Tony and Roy would like to be included in the preliminary meetings</p>	<p>Karen</p>	<p>After July 1</p>
Online Data	<p>1.) Jay Grussing demonstrated the Oregon Progress Board's new online Benchmark Report Generator. Anyone with access to the web can create a custom reports for the benchmarks that interest them.</p>	<p>Use the report generator to add important reports or links to the benchmark. This is the link to the Report Generator</p>	<p>Any SEOW members</p>	

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
Data Gap	<p>1.) One of the SEOW deliverables that needs to be completed in year 2 is development of a plan to increase data capacity for a gap in consumption or consequence data. AMH staff had a preliminary discussion of the data gaps encountered in compiling the profiles and presented five suggestions related to the Oregon Healthy Teens Survey for consideration. SEOW members agreed that increasing youth data capacity is a priority for improvement.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A subcommittee will be working on a plan to increase participation in the OHT so that most of the communities (school districts) in all 36 counties participate. The goal will be to develop a comprehensive plan gain support for the survey and to get school participation to grow rather than dwindle. • A subcommittee will be formed to develop a plan to increase data capacity. This will be a quick planning process (probably 3 to 4 meetings over the next 2 months). It will be important to get participation of the OHT governance committee and Dept. of Ed. 	<p>Recruit volunteers from OHT governance committee and Dept. of Education Set up meetings. Subcommittee volunteers: Roy Gabriel Tony Biglan Caroline Cruz Dagan Wright Matthew Tschabold</p>	Geraldyn	Quickly
OHT survey content and county reports	<p>There were related conversations about the OHT that were intermixed with the data gap conversation. I've tried to summarize the issues as separate topics. <i>Although related, these are separate topics and the data gap that is being addressed by the committee is focused on increasing participation in the OHT and not survey content or the 2005-06 county reports.</i></p>			

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
	<p>1.) A few people expressed concern that the OHT has become general with less specificity for alcohol and drug prevention than when Office of Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs conducted the survey. There was concern that the process of consolidating surveys into a single tool does not provide the data needed for the Strategic Prevention Framework recommended by SAMHSA. There's been quite a bit of drift from the risk and protective factor questions that are part of the Communities That Care survey. These questions are valuable to prevention planning.</p> <p>2.) The length of the OHT survey has to be limited so it can be implemented in 40 minutes in a classroom setting. At present this means that stakeholders who "buy in" to the survey review the survey questions annually. There's a core set of questions that are consistently asked and a limited number of additional questions that can be added. Some questions are only asked every other year. The OHT governance committee has a subcommittee that reviews and revises questions. Geralyn represents AMH on that committee. They will be meeting about 2008 survey content over the summer.</p> <p>3.) Another surprise to some attendees was the change in county reports. For a number of years there were annual county and/or regional reports issued. There was a lot of demand by counties to eliminate regional reports and issue</p>	<p>Compare OHT to the CTC survey and get input on changes for 2008 survey</p>	<p>Geralyn/AMH staff</p>	<p>July 6</p>

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
	<p>county reports. In an attempt to do this, the methodology for issuing county reports changed. In 2006, reports were issued for 31 counties and 1 region based on data from the 2004-05 and 2005-06 school years. <i>This was not a result of conducting the survey every other year.</i> Combining two years of data provided a larger sample size so county, rather than regional reports could be published.</p>			
Defining community	<p>Another deliverable for year 2 of the grant is to develop a community profile. The term “community” is to be defined by the SEOW. AMH staff did some preliminary discussion for a definition and suggested that the community be defined as county for developing the profile.</p>	<p>SEOW members agreed to define “community” as county for the purposes of developing community profiles.</p>		
County profile data	<p>Geralyn provided a draft data set for Lane county. The data set was emailed to a number of participants for review and there were lots of very valuable comments.</p> <p>The following important points were made during discussion of the county profiles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County profiles need to be more than data sets. They should be accompanied by tools to help communities interpret and use the data. • There are 3 levels of profile information: community, professional and technical. The county profiles should really be geared to the community. A single technical appendix can be written for professionals. 	<p>Revise sample county profile for the next meeting.</p> <p>Draft an introduction based on 2002 Prevention Booklets</p>	<p>Geralyn</p> <p>Geralyn</p>	<p>August 2</p>
Legislative update	<p>Stephanie and Gina gave a legislative update that was far more thorough than the summary that</p>			

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
	follows. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following bills were still pending SB 34 (prescription drug monitoring program), SB 184 (2% tax). • The DHS budget still needs to be passed. • The beer tax looks like it will be \$.05 and collected by distributors with 90% of the revenue going to law enforcement. 			
Handouts	CommunityDefinition.doc, DataGaps.doc, LaneCountyReport.pdf, LaneDataSet.xls			

Next meeting: August 2 10:00-2:00
 500 Summer St. Salem
 Conference Room HSB 352