

Surveillance and Evaluation Subcommittee Minutes

Date: July 24, 2009
Time: 9:10 - 9:54 a.m.
Location: Telephone conference call

Members Present

Don Webster Chip Withers
 Dr. Chet Evans

Members Absent

Dr. James Howell
 Dr. Kevin Sherin Michael Lannon

Others Present

Carlos Martinez DOH
 Shelley Robertson Robertson, Inc.
 Lauren Porter DOH

Topic/lead		Status/Follow up
Roll call and welcome	Mr. Martinez called the roll. The call was started ten minutes late because one member was unable to connect to the conference and the members waited until his connection was established.	
Approval of previous minutes	Mr. Webster asked if members had received the last minutes, and if there were any corrections to the minutes. A motion to approve the minutes as written was made. The motion was approved.	Motion seconded and approved by voice vote.
Subcommittee Old Business: Review evaluation matrix and update status of AHEC evaluation contract.	<p>Mr. Webster reminded the members that although the Legislature had been appropriating the funding required by the Constitutional Amendment 4, it was the responsibility of the Advisory Council to look at the effectiveness of the tobacco program, and if needed, make recommendations to the DOH. Members agreed that the evaluation matrix was a good tool to accomplish that goal and complemented staff for creating the current evaluation matrix.</p> <p>Discussion: Mr. Webster briefly reviewed each field of the matrix and asked for discussion. Lauren Porter recommended the matrix be amended to include the start date of each contract so the viewer would know how long the contract had been in place. Members agreed with the recommendation. Mr. Webster further recommended that the evaluation matrix be reviewed at each Tobacco Advisory Council (TAC) meeting. The subcommittee was briefed by Lauren Porter about the status of the AHEC evaluation. The procurement document for AHEC evaluation has been completed and been sent to the DOH procurement office. When approved by that office, the bid will then be advertised, applications received, a vendor selected, and a contract let. Mr. Webster stated that when that contract is let there will be independent evaluation of all the tobacco program components listed on the evaluation matrix.</p>	The evaluation matrix will be amended to include start date. The DOH will review the feasibility of review at each meeting.

Topic/lead		Status/Follow up
<p>New Business: review evaluation reports update from Robertson Inc.</p>	<p>Dr. Shelley Robertson of Robertson Inc. presented a brief explanation of the three community evaluation reports that had been sent to the subcommittee. She also updated the members on the status of recommendations about the community programs made by her company to the DOH. In brief, all of Robertson’s recommendations have been addressed or are in process. The recommendations produced value in the areas listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This year’s new Workplan is more focused. Specifically, interventions with the strongest evidence have been prioritized, and the statewide focus of the program is much clearer. 2) Trainings, toolkits, interviews, and one-on-one technical assistance has been provided by Robertson Group Inc. and DOH staff and grantees have a new self assessment instrument. 3) The grantees and the feedback they provided have had a clear role in determining the type of training and support they received at recent in July in Orlando. The members noted it was amazing the recommendations came out in April and supporting steps were completed in July. <p>Discussion: Don Webster asked if there were any concerns from the grantees that were not addressed? Ms. Robertson responded there were not at this time, but that as evaluation continues there may be additional recommendations. Dr. Robertson stressed that grantees were very appreciative of the resources devoted to improvements of the community programs. Mr. Webster suggested that it might be helpful to give a quick summary of the types of activities the community contracts are doing when Robertson Inc. presents the community overview to the Advisory Council at the August 31-September, 2009 meeting.</p> <p>There was discussion about future funding of grantees and how to best compare performance across counties. Members suggested that successful performance in one county may not necessarily lead to success in other counties. Members suggested looking at the attributes of successful grantees rather than just duplicating one program across counties. Lauren Porter suggested the construction and focus of the new workplans will facilitate cross grantee evaluations.</p>	<p>Program specific context will be presented for each program area at the next Advisory Council meeting.</p>
<p>Other subcommittee issues.</p>	<p>Members referenced their recommendation to have past performance become one of the selection criteria for community grantees by review panels, particularly when there are multiple applicants for one grant. Staff responded that this recommendation was being tracked and there would be an update at the next full council meeting.</p>	<p>The status of this recommendation will be reviewed at the next Advisory Council meeting.</p>
<p>Agenda for the next meeting.</p>	<p>Members requested they be forwarded any evaluation reports that are approved prior to the next subcommittee meeting. There were no specific agenda items requested.</p>	
<p>Recommendations to the TAC</p>	<p>There were no new specific recommendations to the Advisory Council. Previous recommendations will be reviewed at the meeting of August 31, - September 1, 2009.</p>	
<p>Adjournment</p>	<p>The meeting was adjourned at 9:54 a.m.</p>	