SEOW Meeting Minutes for November 17, 2006

<u>Members present</u>:
Dave Bozell, Jeremy Chenevert (proxy for Karla Carr), Terry Cohen, Marcia French, Ruth Gassman, Marion Greene, Harold Kooreman, Kim Manlove, Martha Payne, Chandana Saha, Barbara Seitz de Martinez, Richard Vandyke, John Viernes, Diana Williams, Jim Wolf, Eric Wright

The first order of business was the approval of the meeting minutes from July 21st, September 8th, and October 20th, 2006.

The identification of high-need communities within the six established priorities was the next item on the agenda [tables and maps were handed out]. Eric stated that based on the epidemiologic profile, six priorities had been identified and indicators for each priority had been pinpointed (e.g., DUI and public intoxication are alcohol indicators). Counties were compared and rank-ordered according to these indicators. High-need counties, i.e., the 25% counties that scored highest on the indicators, were marked. Eric emphasized that the model is indicator-driven, i.e., only need (top 25%) not contribution (such as rates of use) was considered. Counties have the opportunity to apply for grants based on their status of need.

Marcia French asked if sufficient local data existed, i.e., if a county does not rank among the top 25% is it due to low need or lack of data. Eric replied that sufficient data on the county level were available. He also stated that the tables and maps will be available online on the SPF SIG website.

Barbara Seitz de Martinez brought up the concern that some counties may not be considered high need (not top 25%) but they know they have a substance abuse problem. They might want to apply for the grant but are not eligible. Eric responded that low-need status should not preclude counties from applying for the grant. The county needs to make the case why it should be eligible for funding. Additionally, this could also serve as motivation for communities to improve their local data system. Richard Vandyke commented that only 9 counties did not exhibit high need for at least one of the alcohol indicators. Eric replied that only a very few counties existed that did not rank among the top 25% in at least one indicator for any of the substances.

Eric then asked two questions:
1) Is this approach of using indictors to define high-need communities reasonable?
2) Is 25% an appropriate cut-off point?

Various SEOW members suggested adding the percentiles to the tables, i.e., instead of only marking counties that fall in the top 25% of any given indicator, using the percentile to get more detailed information (e.g., 10%, 25%, 50%, etc.). Barbara Seitz de Martinez suggested using symbols to identify certain percentiles, such as an asterisk could mark top 10%, another symbol would represent top 25%, etc. Eric announced that the support staff will add the percentiles and that all the information will then be available on the SPF SIG website. He also added that the website will be made more accessible.

John Viernes mentioned that the prevalence data do not include the correction population. Diana Williams replied that the SEOW is welcome to use data from the DOC. Eric made arrangements for Harold to receive the DOC data and reminded members that the project is a "work under construction" and will evolve over the next 5 years.

Ruth Gassman summarized the indicator-driven model of high-need counties and stated that the IPRC could use this information on their website to provide technical support to communities.

Next, the assessment of community readiness was discussed. Eric briefly explained that the support staff has developed a web-based survey to assess the extent to which communities are ready to implement substance abuse prevention programs [a copy of the survey was handed out]. The newly designed questionnaire is based on the *Community Readiness Model* (developed by the Tri-Ethnic Center for Prevention Research) and the *Community Key Leader Survey* (developed by Goodman and Wandersman), which have been both suggested by CSAP's Center for Applied Prevention Technology (CAPT) to evaluate community readiness. The new survey was designed using Survey Monkey, but it is intended to switch over to an in-house data system for reasons of confidentiality and ease of data analysis. The survey is in the process of being pilot-tested. It is planned to administer the instrument to community key leaders/informants (i.e., individuals who are knowledgeable of substance abuse prevention efforts in their counties). Ideally, at least 20-25 people per county will respond. The support team has started a database for potential key informants. Additionally, a 'snowball' system will be in place; respondents of the survey have the opportunity to nominate other people who might be interested in completing the questionnaire as well.

Terry Cohen asked about the time frame for the survey. Eric replied that he would like the questionnaire to be open in December 2006 and January 2007.

Jim Wolf asserted that it might be difficult to compare data from the various counties. Especially low-capacity communities could be at a disadvantage, because "they might be less tuned in to what is really going on". He continued to suggest using sheriffs, county hospitals, and LCCs as key informants; particularly Randy Miller from Drug-Free Marion County would be a valuable source.

Kim Manlove added that local health departments would be more apt in answering community readiness questions than county hospitals.

Eric asked the group for suggestions of groups/agencies/individuals to add to the key informant database. SEOW members suggested: United Way representatives; Indiana Minority Health Coalition (IMHC local chapters); ITPC community-based and minority-based partners; local coalitions; school superintendents; school coordinators; parole officers; prosecutors and judges; Community Mental Health Centers (CMHC); and DSA program directors.

Eric stated that the support staff was going to write a protocol for selecting target key informants and keep the database updated.

Barbara Seitz de Martinez added that the community readiness survey defines community on the county level, but it could also be used to define community on other levels, such as neighborhood or target population.

Ruth Gassman stated that the survey primarily collected subjective not objective data. Eric agreed and replied that he intends to find ways to add some objective data over the next years. Barbara Seitz de Martinez added that question #3 assesses existing prevention efforts/resources, and that a question about funding could be included. Eric was in agreement and stated that a funding question will be added.

The next item on the agenda was the identification of minimum data sets for client-level program outcomes. National Outcomes Measures (NOMs) for adult and youth prevention were discussed briefly [copies of NOMs had been given out]. Eric explained that communities receiving SPF SIG grants are required to have their clients complete the NOMs questionnaire. He then suggested to SEOW members to read the document, reflect on it, and send in items they would like to see added to the NOMs before the next meeting.

Diana Williams proposed to add the question, "Are you using evidence-based practices [ebp] to fidelity or not? If not, why not?" Eric replied that administration of a program in various communities is needed to compare fidelity across communities. He suggested that Afternoons R.O.C.K. is a good example to measure fidelity.

John Viernes wanted to know how to measure abstinence. Eric responded that abstinence was defined as '0 use'. John declared that a sheet with definitions for the questions was needed. Eric agreed and asked Harold to obtain a list of definitions.

Eric then steered the discussion toward new data needs. He asked the SEOW members to take the *Data Use Agreement* to their agencies. The goal is to get access to needed data sources. Eric mentioned that it seems to be more difficult to obtain data from the DCS, DOC, and criminal justice groups. He also stated that he still has not received any prosecutor data.

The 2007 SPF SIG SEOW meeting schedule was handed out. Eric explained that the SPF SIG requires monthly meetings but he suggested meeting bi-monthly at least for the next few months to increase attendance. SEOW members agreed. Jim Wolf proposed to send out materials and converse via email during the months without scheduled meetings. Therefore, the next meeting will be held on January 19, 2007, from 9am – 12pm in the Indiana Government Center South, conference room #5.

After all members completed and handed in an evaluation form of the SPF SIG SEOW meeting, the meeting was adjourned.