

Vermont's Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentives Grant  
EPI WORKGROUP  
January 11, 2006 1:30-3:30pm  
Conference room 3b

Agenda

Introductions

Updates

Joint Fiscal

Review Data

Review Examples Prioritization Grids

Next steps

Schedule next meeting

Meeting: Strategic Prevention Framework (SPF-SIG) – Epidemiology Workgroup Meeting Minutes  
 Date: January 11, 2006  
 Present: Bruce Wilson, Doris Ogden, Jessie Brosseau, Monica Weeber, Pat Worcester, Caroline Dawson, Rod McCormick, John Pandiani, Olivia Hunter, Beth Burgess, David Murphey, Linda Piasecki, Kelly Hale-LaMonda, Lori Uerz; Liz Peterson  
 Recorder: Emily Trutor

Topic	Point Person(s)	Discussion	Follow-Up
John Pandiani's and Pat Worcester Presentation	John Pandiani Pat Worcester	See Power Point Presentation Attached.	The group will continue to look at data as it comes available.  If you have data questions contact Kelly Hale-LaMonda 802-863-7246
Organizing the Data	Kelly Hale-LaMonda	<p>Organizing Data: What are we going to focus on? Indicators?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Size or magnitude</li> <li>▪ Severity</li> <li>▪ Use over time</li> <li>▪ Economic cost</li> </ul> <p>In Vermont we could look to see if the indicator is rising or falling over time or compare Vermont to the national data.</p> <p>We need to factor in multiple dimensions.</p> <p>We could establish a point/scoring grid system.</p> <p>As a group it is our charge to make recommendations to determine/prioritize how the funds should be allocated (i.e., 18 – 24yr olds, alcohol, marijuana).</p> <p>There will be members of the Advisory Council that will participate in the workgroup to help bridge the gaps and help relay information.</p>	See Kelly's Examples  See Connecticut and New Mexico handouts.

	David Murphey	<p>The SPF-SIG Advisory Council will make the final decision on how the funds will be used.</p> <p>Examples/Scoring ideas/Concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Connecticut used a scoring grid and scored all major substances using a point system of 1-5.</li> <li>▪ New Mexico had primary considerations and addressed severity and economic impact then addressed preventability and changeability. They had 100 people rate the information. They compared against 4 or 5 indicators. Their Epi Workgroup came up with two recommendations and their Advisory Council made the final decision.</li> <li>▪ We could add specific new columns to our existing grid.</li> <li>▪ Need to make sure we note data that we don't have on the scoring grid.</li> <li>▪ Need to address the quality of the data we use. (i.e, frequency, data breakdown.)</li> <li>▪ Do we need to engage the public in our decision? We need to make sure the public is able to understand the data and the evaluation mechanism.</li> <li>▪ This project is to look not only funding programs but to also look at policy.</li> <li>▪ We will be adding tobacco indicators.</li> </ul> <p>Other criteria or issues to consider (in addition to US comparisons, trends over time, and percentages/number of people) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Quality of the data (frequency, time lag, breakouts available by age/race/location)</li> <li>• Proxy power</li> <li>• Locust of control</li> <li>• Past the public square test</li> </ul>	
Legislative Update	Lori Tatsapaugh Uerz	The Legislature has not yet accepted the grant but we expect that it will happen within the next couple of weeks.	
Next Meeting	Kelly Hale-LaMonda	For next meeting will start looking at hospital discharge data by substance. We will also look at our grid with new	

		columns (US comparison, trend past 5 years, and percentages/number of people)  Future Meetings: February 8, 2006 1:30pm – 3:30pm March 8, 2006 1:30pm – 3:30pm April 12, 2006 1:30pm – 3:30pm	Kelly will start to fill in new columns in grid.
--	--	---	--