

SPF-SIG Committee meeting minutes, 03-23-2010, 1pm-4pm

Location: Ohio State Center for Learning Excellence

Members Present:

Angela Cornelius-Dawson	Rod Woods	Stacey Gibson
Ruth Satterfield	Yvonne Jordan	Cathy Sperling
Dawn Thomas	Cheryl Danielson	Patricia Harmon
Karen O'Quin	Michael Langford	Janet Chandler
Sanford Starr	Carlos Ramos	Brad Williams
Nicholas Matt	John Bohley	Millie Stevens
Carlos Ramos	Robert Smedley	Janet Groome
Wendy Hunter Vaughn	Kathie Chafie	
Judi Moseley	Phil Atkins	

Members Absent:

Ohio Department of Education	Greg Jefferson
Wilberforce University	Terry Koons
Elaine Georgas	Office of Faith Based Initiatives
Eloise Traina	Tonia Gray

Welcome and introductions

Opening remarks and welcome by Angela Cornelius Dawson, Representative from the Office of the Governor and Director of ODADAS, and Ruth Satterfield, Chief of Prevention, ODADAS and chair of this advisory committee followed by introductions around the room.

Overview of SPF-SIG Grant and Committee Purpose

The Chair of the committee gave a brief overview of the contents of the binder provided to each member and gave a summary of the Strategic Prevention Framework- State Incentive Grant (SPF-SIG). See attachments.

It was also clarified that the Evidence Based Workgroup for the grant will be the ODADAS Improving Prevention Practices (IPP). This group will review and approve the community implementation plans, per grant expectations. The ODADAS IPP, will however, broaden that scope and begin to help existing ODADAS funded programs become validated through a research perspective, and is planned to last beyond the life of the SPF-SIG.

Binder Contents include: SPF-SIG overview, Role of the Ohio SPF-SIG committee, SAMHSA Dimensions for prioritization, Abstract of the grant with objectives, Ohio SPF-SIG Year 2 work plan with timeline, and directory of all committee members. See attachments

SEOW Data Presentation

Sanford Starr and Nicholas Matt from the State Epidemiological Outcomes Workgroup (SEOW) presented a PowerPoint presentation and requested feedback, questions, and suggestions from the group. See the attached PowerPoint that includes speaking notes for further details.

Questions that arose from the presentation:

- If data is available at the county level, would it be included?
 - Yes. Over the next year, the SEOW is working on collecting all data available at the county level to make a directory.
 - It was pointed out that this county data is also important at the legislative level.
- Is data available showing regions where members of the armed forces live?
 - In collaboration with the Department of Mental Health, data on counseling services can be obtained for this group.
 - ODADAS expressed interest in working further with Sgt. Danielson to gather information that could be helpful.
- How are the surveys administered?
 - All the data used is secondary data and is administered through telephone surveys, and computer assisted devices. The sample is large enough for analysis at the State level but because data sets change there is a need for collaboration so as to collect uniform data. This analysis at the State level also provides information for seeking future funding
- Did the SEOW consider Monitoring the Future data?
 - No. We think that is only available at the national level.
- SEOW website was explored to address additional questions. No data was available for a couple questions as the specific data requested is not collected.
- Do you have any data comparing 18-25 yrs in school/college and those who are out of school/college?
 - No. This has not been done at the State level because data is unavailable. The SEOW is working to collect all county level data available within the next year.
 - Discussed this would be interesting data to have in the future and this could be something SPF-SIG could look into.
- Looking at the graphs provided, the graph for alcohol use shows a problem area with 12-17yrs age group. Would it be possible to effectively impact alcohol use at 18-25yrs age group if the younger population is not addressed? Also over 60% of the 12-17yrs age group reported to have used alcohol before the age of 18yrs.
 - That is accurate and the 18-25 yrs age group seems to be above the national average in almost all alcohol and other drug indicators.
 - The 12-17yrs age set has been targeted by the majority of our programs for many years, doing good work.
 - If addressing 18 – 25 yr old consumption, it makes sense that beginning before 18 yrs old could still be a community's direction in order to effect the 18 and 19 year old use over the life of the project.

- Has the SEOW looked at data collected by Health Insurance companies?
 - No. Though this data is important, there are propriety and confidentiality issues.
- Is there any reason perceived for the drop in binge drinking in 1999 and then a rise in 2007?
 - The SEOW checked for change in indicators, or environment during this time in order to remove any errors but none were found.
 - The drop may be due to the wave of evidence based practices and the rise may be attributed to budget cuts for Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities programs. Those are only possibilities. We do not know the real answer to this.

Committee Discussion and Prioritization Selection

Ruth Satterfield, committee chair was the moderator for group discussion.

The discussion began with Ruth identifying the task for the day being to bring SEOW work and their recommendations to the SPF-SIG Committee and then turning the information over to them for processing questions and discussion of what they see in the data and where they think the priority should be. The group brainstormed initial thoughts from information provided previously and at the meeting. Main discussion points follow:

- The group expressed appreciation for the data provided and access to additional data on the website for their communities. There was discussion of the importance of having this type of information available.
- The group agreed that community trends should be considered to achieve good results.
- Ruth informed the group some states were choosing a single substance focus and Sandy Starr shared a few examples of indicators being chosen by other states: Underage Drinking; Alcohol related automobile crashes. The idea of possibly focusing on age range rather than a certain substance was identified as coming out of discussions about the increase in all substance use at the one age range, and that through this type of focus could allow communities to select the substance they wanted to address pertinent to their data.
- The group expressed interest in the age range idea and identified how it would fit with the work that they were doing in their communities and what they were trying to achieve. In general it was agreed upon that age group would allow more communities to participate and to focus on their specific needs.
- Further group discussion related to age group included:
 - Recognition of 18-25 yr old population as a service gap
 - Challenge of gathering data from the 18 – 25 yr old age group
 - Several counties had already begun discussions around the need to address the 18-25 age group
 - Question of continued need of 12-17yr olds
 - Should we focus our efforts on earlier ages in an effort to prevent use from starting in the first place.
 - Could there be a focus on under 21 age group
 - Recognition funds have been provided for services focused on 12 – 17 yr olds for many years and progress has been made, but is there a need to start to provide funds for 18 – 25 also

- Choosing the 18 – 25 yr age group would force stronger community connections with employers and higher education settings
 - Recognition that serving the 18 – 25 age group will bring new challenges to providers as they are not captive audiences accessed in traditional ways
 - Choosing 18-25 age group would still allow targeting of high school age in order to effect 18 and 19 yr old behavior changes over upcoming years
- The question was asked, “how will multiple communities track, or evaluate, their success?”.
 - Evaluators will be involved at both the state and the community level over the lifetime of the grant. They will work individually with each sub recipient on their evaluation.
 - Capacity building and process level evaluation will be a large part of the outcomes. Evaluators will be evaluating capacity, infrastructure and process from the beginning to the end.
 - If this is supposed to be data driven then it is supposed to be researched based. It is hard to identify cause and effect and to measure whether what you are doing makes a difference.
 - This is about the planning process: the process is data driven. Each community will make a strategic plan for their community based on what the data tells them. It is about the planning process, it is not a direct service grant. When communities do get to implementation, there will be a predominant focus on environmental strategies.
 - Members requested the SEOW provide a comparison graph of age cohort by alcohol and other drugs of abuse. This will be provided before the next meeting.
 - An idea was presented from a group member that if the group selects the 18 – 25 age range, a possible way to look at information could be to separate the group into college students and non college students, and then normative behaviors vs defiant behaviors. Indicators could then be selected based on specific target population, and considering access for prevention measures.
 - It was clarified, to track the success of each sub-grantee, evaluator will be used throughout the lifetime of the grant. They will be responsible evaluating the capacity of the program before, during, and after the implementation process of each program.

Due to time constraints the group will continue the discussion to finish priority selection at the next scheduled meeting, Monday, March 29, 2010, 2:00pm – 4:00pm. (****note this was rescheduled to Friday, April 9, 2010**)

This will allow the group to digest the information and discussions held. ODADAS will send additional data related to discussions. The group agreed the follow up meeting needed to be face to face. In the future there will be the opportunity to allow conference call participation for meetings and possibly hold webinars when appropriate.

Next Steps and Meeting

- Prioritization Meeting March 29th, 2010. 2-4pm at the State Library. {Rescheduled for 4/9/10, 1-3pm}
- Draft minutes and information will be sent to members.
 - Additional data based on group discussion/questions
 - Sections of strategic plan, as we begin to write it, will be sent for your review and feedback once we begin to write.
- Review of draft Strategic Plan sections, April 22nd, 2010. The CSAP project officer will be in attendance.