

SPF-SIG Advisory committee meeting minutes 04-09-2010, 1pm-3pm

Location: Ohio Dept. Of Transportation

Members Present:

Angela Cornelius-Dawson
Ruth Satterfield
Dawn Thomas
Karen O'Quin
Sanford Starr
Nicholas Matt

Carlos Ramos
Jan Stine
Cheryl Danielson
John Bohley
Phil Atkins
Terry Koons

Wendy Hunter Vaughn
Yvonne Jordan
Michael Langford
Sandar Gyarmati
Eloise Traina
Patricia Harmon

Members Absent:

Brad Williams
Mollie Stevens
Greg Jefferson

Janet Groome
Rod Woods

Leslie Brower
Cathy Sperling

Kathie Chaffie (sent feedback to Committee)

Janet Chandler (sent feedback to Committee)

Elaine Georgas

Ohio Department of Education- participant not yet identified

Wilberforce University- new participant will join from Central State University

Office of Faith Based Initiatives- new participant will join

Minutes

- Welcome and Introduction by Angela Cornelius-Dawson, director of ODADAS
- Ruth Satterfield facilitated the meeting.
- The minutes from the meeting on 3/23/10 were approved with no additions.
- Carlos Ramos (Hispanic UMADOAP) brought in further state level data to share with the committee. The data was broken into age groups and ranked by county.
- A question was raised asking if the scope of the SPF-SIG is environmental strategies.
 - Answer: It is about planning, infrastructure and capacity building, with a focus on Environmental strategies in the implementation phase.

Small Group Discussions:

Attendees broke into 3 groups of 4, to discuss data and decide upon one or two priorities to suggest for the SPF-SIG priority, based on the data. These groups consisted of at least 1 board representative, 1 provider, and 1 "other" representative. Before beginning discussion, Ruth Satterfield read comments from members who were unable to attend:

From Kathie Chaffee --

Re: the age group to focus on - the groupings (e.g, 12 – 17; 18 – 25) are dictated by our data sources. If we were able to get data on the 18 – 21 group and the 22 - 25 group – I wonder if it would guide us to focus on the 21 and under set. Given that life transition points are so critical in this matter – if a young person can make it to age 22 without using (or abusing) substances – is he at less risk? Any research out there that addresses this?

Finally - a comment re: the brief discussion we had at the first meeting re: comparing young people who are employed vs. young people who are college students – many young people fit into both categories. Some young people continue to live at home while “working their way” through college at a nearby college; others live at residential campuses but some of these are employed. Factors that influence youth who live on residential campuses (whether they work part-time or not) are different from factors that influence youth who live at home and commute to college – we just need to take these into consideration when considering comparisons.

From Janet Chandler –

I have reviewed the information and thought about our last meeting and have several comments and suggestions to throw in for consideration.

The group seems to be leaning toward a focus on the 18-25 year olds.

This may be appropriate. However, I would suggest there be discussion around some of the following questions as we consider this:

- 1) What evidence-based policies, programs, and practices exist that have strong evidence of reaching this audience and having an impact?
- 2) If we target this audience, will we be able to be successful in reaching this audience? How?
- 3) If the strategies for reaching this audience will need to rely heavily on media campaigns, is there evidence that even strong media campaigns can make a difference with this age group?

My bottom-line concern is that whatever focus we take that we will be setting ourselves up for success - that there is a menu of initiatives, programs or practices that will yield strong results.

I suspect that others will raise these and similar questions and I'm sure the group will make sound recommendations.

Groups discussed and posted their suggestions for priority and any clarifying comments.

Group 1

Overall priority recommendation: 18-25 year olds.

Comments:

- We must be culturally competent
- How we define this group
- How this group defines themselves
- Who are they?
- Define environmental strategies

Group 2

Overall recommendation: 18-25 year olds.

Comments:

- Allows community to ID individual needs but does not preclude work with groups under 18
- Military another target population

Group 3

Overall recommendation: 16-20 year olds.

Comments:

- Special focus on sub-population of college freshman/sophomores
 - Lost jobs/back to school
 - Veterans returning to school
 - Tobacco

Further Discussion:

- Clarification was made that CSAP has a standard definition of environmental strategies which will be utilized.
- Cultural competence is worked into every process of the SPF. The state will be responsible for providing training to sub-recipient grantees on cultural competence as part of the state level plan.
- Clarified the importance of making sure we understand the sub-groups within 18-25 as well (college vs. non-college, employed vs. unemployed, living with parents vs. living on their own, rural vs urban, etc.) Recognition of the importance of working with sub-recipient grantees to thoroughly enmesh cultural competence beyond a surface level within the SPF process.
- Committee members talked about the reasoning behind their priority choices.
- **Based on the commonality of their suggested priorities, the group agreed the focus would be on an age group, and allow the communities to select alcohol and/or other drugs based on their data.**
- A brief discussion surrounding the growing concern related to prescription drug abuse was held. The group clarified a community could target prescription drug abuse if their data identified it as a priority, with our approach.
- Based on the data and their discussion the committee highlighted the 12-17age range & 18-25 age range. Ruth Satterfield asked the group to clarify which age group they wanted the project to prioritize. The group that originally identified 16-20, agreed the priority of 18-25 yr. olds would allow the 16 – 20 age group to be addressed if communities identified the need, as work with 16 and 17 year olds could effect data on 18, 19 yr olds over time, and the university/college freshman could be addressed if that was the need in a community. **With this clarification the SPF-SIG Committee came to consensus on the priority of the SPF-SIG project being 18-25 yr. old consumption of alcohol and other drugs.**
- Discussion followed regarding strategies to reach the target population and the need to remain focused on infrastructure and capacity development rather than the strategies/programs.
- The committee expressed interest in learning how other states have implemented strategies and was made aware of the multitude of state websites and resources that have been developed by previous

cohorts to which we have access. Information will be shared to allow committee members to see what other states are doing and resources available. We will put together a summary of all other states that have the SPF-SIG, their priorities, and any lessons learned that have been identified.

Next Steps and Meeting

- **Committee meeting Thursday, April 22, 2010, 1:00pm – 4:00pm, at the State Library.** The Center For Substance Abuse Prevention (CSAP), Project Officer, and Center For the Application of Prevention Technologies (CAPT) central region expert team representative will attend the meeting and present.
- Draft minutes and information will be sent to committee members
 - Draft minutes will be sent for your review and feedback.
 - Sections of strategic plan, as we begin to write it, will be sent for your review and feedback.