

State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup Meeting July 31, 2006

Attendees: *Roy Gabriel, RMC Research* *Chris O'Neill, Workdrugfree*
Joe Koziol, CCCH *Judy Cushing, OP*
Mel Kohn, PH *Karen Wheeler, OMHAS*
Geralyn Brennan, OMHAS *Matt Tschabold, OCCF*
Joyce Grant-Worley, PH *Mike Ponder, OP*
CA Baskerville, Lane Co HHS *Pat Pitman, OCCF*
Angela Vehrs, OMHAS *John Spence, JCP/Tribes*
Stephanie Soares Pump, Governor's Council on A&D Abuse

Updates:

- Introduced Geralyn Brennan as new State Epidemiologist for the SEOW.
- Karen reported on CSAP visit regarding Synar Report last week. Karen hopes the SEOW will help shape the strategic plan.

Debrief SEOW Workgroup in DC: Geralyn provided an overview of the SEOW training in DC. There were 15 states represented at the training, with a lot of opportunity for sharing among the participants.

- CSAP emphasized that the epi profiles were to focus on State data analysis first, after the state data has been analyzed for significant race/ethnicity, gender or age findings, then go to county level analysis. They also recommended that the workgroups focus on consumption and health consequence data rather than criminal and juvenile justice impacts or other consequence data that may not be directly caused by substance use such as child abuse.
- CSAP has posted the State Epidemiological Data Set (SEDS) at <http://www.epidcc.samhsa.gov/default.asp> . States that just analyze this dataset will still meet the minimum profile requirement.
- The states in attendance generally felt that there were a lot of limitations to looking at data from the state level. The states feel a need to get down to the local level (county, region or community) in order to develop and implement prevention plans that will get results.
- CA noted that in planning for prevention one needs to consider data around risk factors that get at “why” people are drinking for example. Data that can be used in the development of logic models and identifying the strategies that will result in an impact on consumption.

It was also noted that it's important to keep in mind that limited amount of funds are dedicated to prevention and there is a lot of work that needs to be done to impact state level data.

- A number of states are struggling to get datasets from their partners. Some haven't been able to pull together the partners they need for the SEOW. Others found that the workgroup fell apart over time.
- Most states agreed that the best data was for youth. Nearly all implemented the YRBS or an equivalent of the Oregon Healthy Teen Survey. They also agreed that adult consumption and consequence data was generally lacking, especially in comparison to what is gathered for teens.
- Of the states presenting their epi profile work to date, all put a high priority on underage drinking, the rest of the priorities varied across the states. For example Kentucky and Louisiana had "reduction of tobacco use" as a high priority but Wisconsin didn't include tobacco on their priority list at all.

Planning for a Charter: "Tips for developing a workgroup charter" were handed out and reviewed. OMHAS staff will generate a rough draft and send to the group for comment. It was noted that before a charter is finalized, it should be reviewed by the Partners for Children and Families, Governor's Council on Alcohol and Drug Abuse Programs, OMHAS Administration, DHS Cabinet then Bruce.

- Recommendation was made to create a web page for the SEOW and post minutes, agendas, etc.
- Recommendation was made to form a subcommittee to work on a mission statement and principals. (Karen, Mel, GERALYN and Judy will work on a draft mission.)

Review of National Outcome Measures: This agenda item was postponed until the next meeting.

State Profiles: "Developing a State Epi Profile" was handed out and reviewed.

- It was noted that we need to be smarter about how we use data. The epi profiles need to be documents that can become a "lay person" advocacy tool. Stephanie shared copies of the "Portland Profile" and the June 2005 "Douglas County Drug Impact Index" as examples.

The first place that the epi profiles may be used is with the legislature. It would be great to have a solid model by March.

- If members haven't had a chance to review the Council's plan, "The Domino Effect" it can be found at http://www.oregon.gov/DHS/addiction/gov_council/main.shtml . It was noted a number of times that the work of the SEOW will be used to inform the work of the Governor's Council. In the future, they hope to do a report on effectiveness of prevention and the SEOW data can serve as a baseline.
- A state profile subcommittee was recommended. Geralyn and Joyce volunteered.
- It was agreed that profiles will be completed for alcohol, marijuana, tobacco and meth
- Need to take a minimalist approach to indicators. There was a suggestion to start by looking at the benchmarks.

Parking lot: The following points were made in the meeting and may need to be added to future agendas or subcommittee work:

- There's a much better body of "what works" than we communicate. We will use evidence-based programs and distribution of facts will change that.
- We need "sustainable" messages and models.
- We need to define "high quality data"
- A mechanism or process needs to be put in place for "emerging" issues and dealing with changing "drugs of choice." How will the profiles deal with this?
- Need to define the audience before writing the profiles
- Talk about audience, data sources, methods of data collection and reporting, key characteristics of data sources we're looking for.

Action Items:

<i>What</i>	<i>Who</i>	<i>When</i>
Develop draft mission statement for the SEOW	Karen, Mel, Geralyn and Judy	9/7/06
Survey SEOW members top 3 ideas of what to measure	Geralyn	9/7/06
Bring mortality data in Oregon	Joyce	9/7/06

Next meeting: Thursday, September 7, 10:00-2:00 in the Human Services Building, Rm 137 (500 Summer St NE Salem, OR).