

Vermont's Strategic Prevention Framework State Incentives Grant  
EPI WORKGROUP  
December 14, 2005 2-4pm  
Conference room 3b

Agenda

Introductions

Updates

- Joint Fiscal
- Advisory Council Mtg
- DC Orientation
- Grid

Review Data

Next steps

- Review timeline
- What is else needs to be done
- Assign tasks

Next meeting: January 11, 2006 **1:30-3:30** (note time change!) room 3b Burlington

Meeting: Strategic Prevention Framework – Epidemiology Workgroup Meeting  
 Date: December 14, 2005  
 Present:  
 Recorder: Emily Trutor

Topic	Point Person(s)	Discussion	Follow-Up
Joint Fiscal Update	Kelly Hale-LaMonda	<p>This grant has not yet been approved by Joint Fiscal.</p> <p>Hope to have funds available in January, but may be as late as February.</p> <p>Positions will probably not be hired until April 2006.</p> <p>Delays are related to there being three very large grants before Joint Fiscal, consisting of a very large amount of money and concerns about how it relates to Global Commitment.</p> <p>There is not a concern of the grants not being approved but that it is an opportunity for the House and Senate Appropriations Committees to ask questions.</p>	Kelly will keep group updated
Advisory Council Meeting Update	Kelly Hale-LaMonda Linda Piasecki	<p>The first meeting of the Advisory Council was held November 30, 2005 at the Cyprian Learning Center in Waterbury, Vermont.</p> <p>The meeting was well attended by approximately 40 representatives from around the State.</p> <p>The group received an overview of the grant and specifically the charge of the Epidemiology (Epi) Workgroup.</p> <p>Some of the Epi Workgroup members are on the Advisory Council. The hope is that this will assist in relaying info back and forth.</p> <p>Council members are interested in how the data will be collected and how it will be used.</p>	

<p>Grant Overview Meeting in Washington, DC</p>	<p>Kelly Hale-LaMonda</p>	<p>Lori Uerz, Linda Piasecki, Kelly Hale LaMonda and Deputy Commissioner Barbara Cimaglio attended.</p> <p>It was a 2.5 day meeting with the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP) and 4 other states in the second cohort group.</p> <p>CSAP reviewed the expectations of the entire grant and workgroups. It was very useful to talk to other states just starting out and to states that have already collected and evaluated their data.</p> <p>New Mexico focused on alcohol mortality (their rate is very high). Their state will address motor vehicle crashes for 18-25 year olds.</p> <p>Connecticut had a more difficult decision to make because nothing obviously jumped out in their data. They worked on organizing their data by substance. Alcohol use is their priority.</p>	
<p>The Priority Grid</p>	<p>Kelly Hale LaMonda</p>	<p>Kelly Hale-LaMonda emailed the members of the Epi Workgroup a list of 14 consequences to prioritize. Each member had to pick their top 5 consequences and prioritize them.</p> <p>The Grid focuses on information from the CSAT national database regarding consumption and consequences and what the recommendations are from that database, as well as, this group.</p>	<p>See Grid Attached</p>
<p>Substance Abuse Treatment Issues</p>	<p>John</p>	<p>Crime and Treatment Issues.</p>	<p>See attached PowerPoint Presentation.</p>

<p>Review of Vermont Data (corresponding to grid)</p> <p>Items of consideration/concern.</p>	<p>Kelly Hale-LaMonda</p> <p>Caroline Dawson</p>	<p>Review of Vermont specific data.</p> <p>Hospitalizations related to alcohol and/or illicit drugs</p> <p>Items to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Most of Vermont’s treatment needs are related to alcohol.</li> <li>▪ How is the group going to make a recommendation?</li> <li>▪ How are we going to develop our criteria using indicators, trends, etc.? A rating sheet? Scorecard?</li> <li>▪ Need to make sure that we consider population size when evaluating the data.</li> <li>▪ Need to pay attention to primary diagnosis.</li> <li>▪ Are we going to look at DUI data? What does Vermont look like compared to the rest of the country?</li> <li>▪ Need to make sure we are not comparing “apples and oranges”?</li> <li>▪ What percentage are college students from out-of-state?</li> <li>▪ Need to be sure we address all age groups in our data collection.</li> <li>▪ Can we measure who has received alcohol and drug education?</li> <li>▪ Do we want to look at co-occurring disorders data?</li> <li>▪ How do we want to distribute data between meetings?</li> </ul>	<p>See attached PowerPoint Presentation.</p> <p>See excel graphs</p> <p>Need to compile a list of current data sources and what data people want to see (i.e., medical examiner data.)</p>
--	--	---	--

Next Meeting	Kelly Hale-LaMonda 802-863-7236  Lori Uerz 802-652-4149	For next meeting would like to bring examples of scoring mechanisms and to discuss how we will compare one indicator versus another  Next Meeting: January 11, 2006 1:30-3:30 3B 108 Cherry St, Burlington	The group would like to review New Mexico and Connecticut's scoring systems.
--------------	---	--	--