Meeting Minutes

SPF SIG Advisory Council

July 27th, 2010

The SPF SIG Advisory Council met via "Meet Me" teleconference on July 27th from 9:30-10:45 AM. In attendance were Melissa Stone, Kathy Allely, Donn Bennice, Peggy Brown, Cindy Cashen, Diane Casto, Delisa Culpepper, Jesse Metzger, Sarah Dewane, Shirley Gifford, Audie Holloway, Shirley Pittz, Sandy Samaniego, Cristy Willer, Devon Urquhart, Jody Barnett and Steven King.

❖ Reviewed Priority Setting Documents

These documents were sent out in two parts for your review before our August face to face meeting. The priority setting documents help people in the position of the Advisory Council to help identify priority areas based on the data which will be presented to you in our upcoming meeting in August.

❖ Breakdown of EPI Workgroup Phase I & II

The EPI Workgroup is made up of two phases for data evaluation. The EPI Workgroup is currently finishing up Phase II of the data evaluation.

- Phase I: The EPI Workgroup is reviewing Consumption and Consequence data and reviewing the quality of data. While evaluating quality, the EPI group focuses on five components; these components are as follows:
    1. Availability
    2. Consistency
    3. Timeliness
    4. Consistency
    5. Sensitivity

    When the scoring began, the EPI Workgroup identified 253 indicators. All of these indicators were scored for quality; if the quality scores scored 80% (8 out of 10) or higher, they graduated to Phase II of the data process. After the quality scoring approximately 73 indicators remained. These indicators went to Phase II of the EPI scoring process. To review more of the scoring process, please refer to page 4 of the SEOW report sent to you prior to our meeting.

- Phase II: The EPI Workgroup reviewed the 73 indicators and scored the data based on its relevance to the SPF SIG. To score data relevance the workgroup reviewed five components:
    1. Severity
    2. Magnitude
    3. Cultural Sensitivity
    4. Changeability
    5. Trends

  Originally the EPI Workgroup was to score Societal Impact along with Trends, but after voting decided that it would be more appropriate for the Advisory Council to assess Societal Impact on the final indicators.

❖ <u>Data Development</u>

Although the data for the following indicators were not strong enough to make it through Phase I, the EPI Workgroup is leaving these indicators open for development. If the Advisory Council chooses the following areas as a priority area during our August meeting, the EPI Workgroup will look at developing new ways to evaluate this data to ensure the SPF SIG is a data driven process.

- Domestic Violence as a consequence to alcohol/drug consumption
- Suicide Attempts as a consequence to alcohol/drug consumption
- Suicide Completion as a consequence to alcohol/drug consumption
- Child Abuse/Neglect as a consequence to alcohol/drug consumption

❖ <u>Comments/Questions/Concerns from Council Members</u>

- Cindy Cashen: Cindy has concerns with utilizing too much self-reported data. She would like us to use "hard data" which examines evidence, rather than someone reporting their behaviors.
- Donn Bennice: Donn inquired about the Healthy Kid's Survey. He wanted to know if and how it was used in the EPI Workgroup's process. Deborah Hull-Jilly advised Donn that that while Healthy Kid's Survey wasn't used, the EPI Influences Subgroup used the School Climate Connectedness Survey for many of their indicators.
- Diane Casto and Shirley Pittz: Diane inquired as to the reason why data was unable to be gathered from OCS. Shirley stated that ORCA (the OCS data system) does not currently collect data on child abuse and neglect. Deborah Hull-Jilly will work with Mike Matthews at OCS to retrieve data. The Children's Policy Team discussed using the

Alaska Screening Tool to gather this data with OCS families, as it measures substance use, mental health status, Traumatic Brain Injury, and trauma.

- Audie Holloway: Audie inquired about the DEA data timeline; this timeline evaluates 5 years' worth of data. "N" does not represent the number of seizures during this timeline, but is related to scoring. "N" refers to the number of voting members who took part in the Phase II Process.
- Shirley Gifford: Wanted to know what indicators were being used to reflect age of onset use. There are a few identified indicators where participant's are asked if they began engaging in behaviors/use before age 13. Shirley also inquired about data which explores the "source" of alcohol for under age users. The Influence Subgroup works more with these areas; this subgroup will also reflect how the future RFP is written to help target appropriate populations.

❖ <u>Future Advisory Council Meetings</u>

On August 2nd and 3rd the Advisory Council will meet face-to-face with the EPI & EBI Workgroups, as well as SPF SIG staff in Anchorage, Alaska. During this meeting we will review the top 10-20 priorities defined by the EPI workgroup, as well as hear about current projects from the EPI and EBI Workgroups. Once the information is presented the Advisory Council will determine the 2-3 top priority areas/indicators. Meeting details are as follows:

- Meeting Location: Embassy Suites, Anchorage, AK
- Meeting Dates: August 2nd & 3rd, 2010
- Meeting Times: Day 1: 10 AM to 4:30 PM; Day 2: 8:30 AM to 4:30 PM.

Please Note: As this meeting quickly approaches it is imperative you submit your travel requests to your department's travel person. Please advise Devon Urquhart if you have not yet submitted your travel request. If you are unable to attend the August meeting, please contact Devon Urquhart so that she may review your comments/questions/concerns and present them at the meeting. You may also submit written comments to the data prior to the August meeting.