

# State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup Meeting

## October 5, 2006

**Attendees:** *Roy Garbriel, RMC Research*    *Dennis Deck, RMC Research*  
*Joe Koziol, CCCH*                                *Dennis Embry, PAXIS Institute*  
*Jon Collins, AMH*                                *Geralyn Brennan, AMH*  
*Angela Vehrs, AMH*                            *Joyce Grant-Worley, PH*  
*Martin Hankins, ORI*                        *Tony Biglan, ORI*  
*Rey Agullano, AMH*                         *Jeff Ruscoe, AMH*  
*Caroline Cruz, AMH*  
*Mike Ponder, Oregon Partnership*  
*Stephanie Soares Pump, Governor's Council on A&D Abuse*

### **Review of Minutes from September meeting:**

- Minutes from the September 7 meeting were reviewed. No corrections were noted.
- Revisions to the draft charter were completed and emailed to the SEOW. The final charter is due March 2007. Further revisions will be revisited after the draft profiles are completed (draft epi profiles are due mid-December).

### **Development of Fact Sheets:**

The workgroup reviewed two AMH fact sheets: "OHT Spotlight: Underage Drinking" and "Methamphetamine: Facts and Figures." There was extensive conversation about how valuable fact sheets like these are and the features that make them powerful tools. There was a lot of discussion regarding content and form of fact sheets. Following is a summary of the key points made:

- Before fact sheets can be developed, the data needs to be examined so that important topics are identified.
- The strength of the fact sheets is their ability to get out the basic facts and data about specific topics related to alcohol, tobacco and other drugs.
- The main audiences for fact sheets include legislators and all stakeholders. As a result they may be used in a wide variety of applications: community presentations, schools, communication with medical care providers, state councils, commissions, and task forces.
- Three basic content areas that contribute to the development of an effective fact sheet were discussed. These three were identified as fundamental information for fact sheets, but not the only content. Additional information will vary depending on the topic.

1. Prevalence data-the basic facts and numbers about the issue.
  2. Financial impact of the issue or cost-benefit information regarding prevention/treatment.
  3. What can be done-information on “what’s working,” next steps, a plan of action, or web links to valuable resources.
- The discussion around form of the fact sheets included the following thoughts:
    1. Fact sheets should have a consistent look and layout. It would be good if they included the same consistent message or statement of values on every fact sheet. (A branding message of what kind of state we want to create. Stephanie Pump would be good to involve in branding.)
    2. Each fact sheet should be simple and focused, a “few tight points” on one two-sided page.
    3. It would be nice to set up templates on the web with links to county level or legislative district level data so that locals can generate a fact sheet that will speak best to their audience/stakeholders.

### **Development of Epi Profiles:**

A sample profile was provided from the “Binge Drinking” section of Wyoming’s epi profiles. Below is a summary of the key points of conversation regarding the development of Oregon’s epi profiles:

- The epi profiles should lean to the fact sheet format information rather than the large Wyoming profile example that was provided at the meeting.
- Initially, the state analysis must be conducted. Then the workgroup can look at county level data.
- As much as possible, the workgroup would like to have county level profile data. There were two models mentioned that can serve to inform assessment of the data and guide how the profiles are developed: “Communities that Care” and the “Strategic Prevention Framework.” County profiles should all be formatted uniformly and include the same data sets.
- Oregon’s demographic changes need to be considered in developing the profiles.
- Look at trend data and go back in time as far as possible for each measure. Identify if Oregon has trends that differ from US trends.

- Make national comparisons using National Survey on Drug Use and Health data
- The initial data to be examined for all topics include:
  1. 30 day use
  2. Age of initiation
  3. Accessibility
  4. Perception of risk of harm
  5. Relevant law enforcement/crime data
- Additional alcohol-specific data was identified:
  1. Binge drinking
  2. Heavy drinking
  3. Alcohol related motor vehicle crashes
  4. MIP arrests
  5. DUI arrests
  6. Survey data regarding drinking and driving
  7. Suicide
  8. OLCC enforcement data
  9. OLCC sales data (taxes collected by county)
- The people listed below volunteered to review the initial data gathering and analysis on specific topics.

<i>Alcohol</i>	<i>Tobacco</i>	<i>Marijuana</i>	<i>Meth</i>	<i>Other Drugs</i>
Stephanie	Martin	Stephanie	Tony	Tony
Martin	Tony	Joe	Roy	
Joe	Mike	Mike	Dennis D	
Mike	Jill Thompson	Tony		
Tony		Dennis D		
Roy				

### **Policy Option Packages**

It was noted that 16 agencies in Oregon relate, in some aspect, to alcohol, tobacco or drug use and addiction issues. In this way the prevention framework and profile data sets will have an impact that reaches beyond DHS, Addictions and Mental Health Division. The Governor’s Council, in the “Domino Effect,” noted the need for continued support of the Oregon Healthy Teen Survey and the need to expand to include surveys of sixth grade.

The SEOW wants to make leadership aware of the impact of this work and how it can be supported through current DHS policy option packages.

Stephanie Pump agreed to send some language to Roy to serve as a basis for a letter of support for the SEOW prevention framework profiles and the importance of data as it relates to the POPs. Roy will work with Jon and Karen to draft the letter (and include the “OHT Spotlight: Underage Drinking”?). Roy and Tony will review the letter and it will be submitted to Bruce Goldberg.

**Action Items:**

<i>What</i>	<i>Who</i>	<i>When</i>
Contact Lisa Millet regarding LEDS data	Geralyn	9/15/06
Look into data from OSHA that may be of value to the SEOW and epi profiles	Mimi Bushman	10/05

**Parking Lot**

- Think about paying for placement of fact sheets in Oregon Teacher Association Newsletters.
- Note that the following data is not currently available and would be valuable to collect:
  1. County level Adult Behavioral Survey data.
  2. We need more tribal data. NARA may be a source.

**Next meeting:** Thursday, November 2, 10:00-2:00  
3414 Cherry St, Suite 150

**Directions to 3414 Cherry Avenue from I-5 Southbound:** Take the Salem Parkway exit and go straight at the signal. Follow Salem Parkway for about ½ mile until you see Cherry Avenue on your right. Take a right on Cherry Ave. and another right at 3414 Cherry Avenue. The meeting is in Suite 150.

**Directions to 3414 Cherry Avenue from I-5 Northbound:** Take the Keizer exit. Take a left at the signal. Go straight for about 1/8 mile and take a left onto Salem Parkway exit. Follow Salem Parkway for about ½ mile until you see Cherry Avenue on your right. Take a right on Cherry Ave. and another right at 3414 Cherry Avenue. The meeting is in Suite 150.