

OKLAHOMA EVIDENCE BASED WORKGROUP

MARCH 4, 2011

ODMHSAS – CONFERENCE ROOM A

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLAHOMA

MINUTES

Members Present:

James Allen

Dr. David Wright

Dr. Don Baker

Cortney Yarholar

Gayle Jones

Patty Martin

Kelvin Hobbs

CALL TO ORDER AND MEMBER INTRODUCTIONS- JAMES ALLEN

All members and ODMHSAS Staff introduced themselves to familiarize everyone with those that were unable to attend the first meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM THE JANUARY 14, 2011 MEETING

Dr. David Wright moved to approve the minutes. That motion was seconded by Patty Martin. January 14, 2011 meeting minutes approved by majority vote.

DEVELOPMENT OF OPERATING PROCEDURES

Discussion on this agenda item started out with questions around the purpose, mission, and responsibility of the EBP Workgroup. James Allen directed the groups focus to the OPLC Operating Procedures and MN EBP Workgroup By-Laws for guidance. The following is a list of changes and adaptations of the EBP Workgroup Operating Procedures:

Responsibilities Article 2 Section 1: *“Development of review criteria for use by SPF-Sig grantees.”*

Responsibilities Article 2 Section 2: *“Approval/Disapproval of EBP Workplans submitted by SPF-SIG grantees”*

Responsibilities Article 2 Section 3: *“Review of workplans for the purposes of approval or requesting revision.”*

Responsibilities Article 2 Section 4: *“Workgroup Chair will submit a written response to grantees regarding recommendations.”*

Membership Article 3 Section 1.5: *“Members of the workgroup shall serve for the duration of SPF-SIG funding or as determined by the appointing authority”.*

Membership Article 3 Section 2: *“Retention of membership requires attendance at 4 of 6 regularly scheduled meetings per calendar year.”*

Meetings Article 4 Section 3: *“This body will be subject to and abide by the requirements of the Oklahoma Public Meeting Act.”*

Conflict of Interest Policy Article 5 Section 1: *“Any member of the workgroup for whom a conflict may exist, will abstain from roll call voting in regards to the respective agency”*

(the following is policy pulled straight from the MN EBP By-Laws at the suggestion of the workgroup)

Section 1. Conflict

A. *An action by which a member of the EBPW or of a committee would obtain personal gain will be regarded as creating a conflict of interest.*

B. *Any member having a known conflict of interest or potential conflict of interest shall so inform the EBPW Chair and DHS-ADAD and shall request permission to withdraw while the matter in which such conflict of interest may exist is under consideration. The Chair and DHS-ADAD may, at their discretion, allow the member to participate in appropriate discussion, but under no circumstances shall the member participate in decision making or voting.*

C. *Any member of the EBPW or committee may raise questions of possible conflict of interest by another member.*

Section 2. Abstention

A. *EBPW members or committee members who have a conflict of interest on a specific sub-recipient grantee’s strategic plan shall not participate in reviews, recommendations, or decisions on that plan.*

B. *Any member of the EBPW or of a committee shall abstain from voting on any matter that could cause a conflict of interest or the appearance of a conflict of interest.*

Section 3. Resolution

All questions regarding actual or potential conflict of interest shall be decided by majority vote of the members present who do not themselves have a conflict of interest.

Section 4. Examples of a Sub-recipient Grantee Conflict of Interest

A conflict of interest may include, but is not limited to, the conditions below.

“Grantee” refers to the fiscal agent, the community coalition, the SPF SIG grant coordinator, or other local SPF SIG grant staff members. The conditions include:

- A. The member is employed by the grantee.*
- B. The member is a personal friend or close relative of the grantee.*
- C. The member currently receives payment for services performed for, or goods received by, the grantee under a contractual arrangement.*
- D. The member serves on a decision-making board, such as the community coalition or the Board of Directors or Trustee, for the grantee.*
- E. The member is a competitor of the grantee and would be directly affected by any decision made on the application.*
- F. The member has a financial, fiduciary, or other direct interest in the development, expansion, or support of the grantee.*
- G. The member has contributed and/or assisted in writing the strategic plan under consideration.*

Amendments and Revisions Article 6

- A. These by-laws may be amended at any meeting of the EBPW by a two-thirds (2/3) vote, provided a quorum (50% of voting members) is present.*
- B. The proposed amendment must be mailed to each member of the EBPW at least two weeks prior to the meeting.*
- C. After approval, all amendments or revisions shall be effective immediately.*

ODMHSAS EBP Matrices

Patty Martin opened discussion on the ODMHSAS EBP Matrices that will serve to assist the grantees in identifying and selecting strategies. The matrices combines research from PIRE and the Social Development Research Group(SDRG), that couples causal factors with risk and protective factors. The document provided, laid out a clear plan on strategies and supporting evidence which the workgroup agreed would be a viable resource for the grantees in *“helping them not feel lost”*.

DEVELOPMENT OF A SCORING TOOL

Discussion began on scoring tools and review criteria for grantee workplans. This led to the formulation of a multi-level review procedure to be revisited at the next meeting. The following is a record of what guidelines have been assembled to date:

If the EBP’s meet definition 1 of an evidence based program, then move to evaluation of workplan.

If no, compare to definition 2. If workplan meets Definition 2 of an EBP, move to evaluation of workplan.

If no, then compare to Definition 3. If workplan meets Definition 3, it must then meet 3 of the 4 following criteria.

- a. Reviewable logic model*
- b. Similar to program on the federal registry (format side-by-side, citations to compare programs.*
- c. Supported by documentation of credible results from past use (findings and data)*
- d. Reviewed and deemed appropriate by the EBP Workgroup.*

If the submitted workplan does not meet any of the above criteria, the chair shall submit a written response to grantees regarding recommendations.

IDENTIFY DOMAINS

Due to time constraints, discussion on this agenda item was moved to the May 6 meeting.

ANY OTHER BUSINESS

None.

MEETING SCHEDULE

The next meetings will be held on:

May 6, 2011

July 1, 2011

September 2, 2011

ADJOURNMENT

The third Oklahoma EBP Workgroup meeting was dismissed at 4:35pm