

Indiana State Epidemiology and Outcomes Workgroup

Meeting Minutes from January 18, 2008

Attendance

Matt Bilkey, Dave Bozell, Weston Bush, Marcia Dias, Marcia French, Matt Frische, Marion Greene, Harold Kooreman, Mary Lay, Kim Manlove, Barbara Seitz de Martinez, Miranda Spitznagle, Rick VanDyke, Jim Wolf, Eric Wright, Randy Zaffuto

Welcome and Approval of Meeting Minutes

Eric welcomed everybody to the meeting. The minutes from November 16, 2007, were approved.

Summary of Training Workshop from January 17, 2008

Barbara reported: all funded communities, except Delaware, were present; the consensus was that the training was successful; we talked about logic models and data; interactive discussion – subgroups talked about their data sources and brainstormed about additional sources; the importance of change/willingness to change was emphasized; also emphasis on sustainability. Randy added that he had liked to see more statistical analyses added to the training. Eric replied that this is something that needs to be addressed by TA because of the different needs of communities. Rick suggested writing something down for communities, a paragraph of each of the issues, such as rates, standard deviations, central tendencies, etc. Eric agreed to create a Q&A sheet with basic statistical terms and procedures. Randy replied that he would work on the statistical Q&A sheet.

Marcia proposed that the funded communities send their local epidemiological drafts to the SEOW for feedback. Eric responded that, to lessen the burden on the SEOW, he, Harold, and Marion could provide the feedback.

Marcia added to Barbara's summary that Lisa Hutcheson from ICRUD (Indiana Coalition to Reduce Underage Drinking) presented on environmental strategies.

Discussion of SPF SIG Survey

Jim provided three hand-outs (draft of the substance use survey; map of 2001 congressional redistricting plan; and proposed sampling plan) and reported: the map shows the 9

congressional districts in Indiana; each district has roughly the same population size; the proposed sampling plan hand-out shows a table with the 9 districts and the funded communities (highlighted yellow); we'll oversample the funded communities; the goal is to have no less than 600 per district and no less than 400 per target/community – this will provide us with defensible estimates at the county-level; in some districts we'll only have a sample of 600 because no funded communities are within the district (e.g., district 5), in others we have a sample of 1,200 (e.g., district 1 with funded Lake and Porter counties); the total number of interviews is 8,000; the gold standard is to employ random dialing and then ask the respondent how many individuals in your household are 12 or older – the computer then selects whom to interview in the household; however, some clients can't afford the gold standard – alternative: talk to the youngest male in the household (if ≥ 12)/if he is not available we talk to the youngest female in the household (if ≥ 12); the rationale behind this approach is that women are twice as likely to participate than men and older individuals are more likely to participate than younger ones; by using this approach we don't have to weigh the data (will result in the right age and gender breakdown); it is not as safe as the gold standard but more efficient; I suggest to use it or at least experiment with it. Jim then discussed the survey draft in detail: this version is different from last time's version; we took out the DSM categories from the STNAP; the questionnaire is for youths and adults – it contains skip patterns; p. 1 contains screening questions; questions 2-25 only for youths (if age > 17, skip to Q26).

Eric mentioned that social norms questions should also be asked of adults. After a brief discussion of social norms among the SEOW members, Eric stated that Harold will look into this some more and will do a literature search on the topic.

Other comments made by SEOW members include: most people won't know what benzodiazepines are – better to focus on prescription drugs in general; the term "illegal" in regard to prescription drugs is problematic since they are prescribed – better to use "misuse" or "non-medical use"; also need to add over-the-counter (OTC) drugs.

Q35-36 (pp. 10-11) tobacco use: need to keep tobacco questions as they are (NOMs requirement) but add Miranda's suggestions (a) have you smoked at least 100 cigarettes in your life and (b) do you now smoke every day/some days/not at all; also ask participants who conveyed tobacco use, which product they use (e.g., cigars, pipe, snuff, chew).

Q38 (pp. 11-12) binge drinking: new/modified definition of binge drinking (4 or more alcoholic beverages for females/5 or more alcoholic beverages for males) – we need to add skip pattern depending on male/female respondent.

Q40 (p.13) illegal drug use: we need to add OTC drugs to the list and also ask participants which of these substances they have used.

Mary wanted to know what happens if participants answer some of the questions but then hang up without finishing the instrument. Jim answered that this will count as an “incomplete”; however, we can set a completion threshold, i.e., if they answer at least a certain number of questions the responses can be used for analysis (missing questions will be treated as missing values). Similarly, if participants refuse to answer some of the questions, those will be coded as missing values. Mary added that Q44-45 (p. 17) might be offensive and promote a hang-up. SEOW members agreed and Eric decided to drop Q44 and Q62 (similar to Q44). Harold mentioned that Q42 (p. 16) and Q59 (p. 19) should only be asked of adults not youths. Questions on demographics: Matt (or Weston?) pointed out that some 12-year olds might not know what “Caucasian” means (add “Caucasian/White”); in regard to race/ethnicity, let participants select all that apply (rather than force them to make a choice).

Three of the questions are for geocoding purposes (zip code, street, first cross street); if participants refuse to give zip code, the following two questions will not be asked; but even if they don't give us their zip code, we still have their area code for county information; geocoding provides important information – also look at census information, such as racial distribution, median income, etc., for the neighborhood.

Eric asked if the survey will be ready by February 1 and if administration will be completed by July 31, 2008. Jim confirmed; we will survey the funded communities first and give them their data at the same time.

Eric announced that printed copies of the SEOW report will be available by Tuesday, to be handed out at the GAC meeting. Also, the Governor's press release for the 2007 epi profile went out (http://www.in.gov/newsroom.htm?detailContent=121_14579.htm).

Other Business

Matt Bilkey is ISP's new commander of the Meth Suppression Unit. He introduced himself, as did SEOW members. Eric briefly summarized the purpose of the proposed substance use survey.

Then, Eric adjourned the meeting.

The next SEOW meeting will be held on Friday, March 14, 2008, from 9am through 12 noon, at the IGCS, Teleconference Media Center.