

**Date:** 10/1/04

**Meeting Title:** EBP Selection & Validation Workgroup

**Attendees:** D. Deurscheidt, D. Ewbank, J. Collins, J. Hromco, S. Minta, C. Hartman, K. Greene, E. Whitmore, J. Harris, S. Chan, B. Malek, B. Friesen, k. Dudley, P. Clark., J. Spence, B. Fujita, P. Martel, V. Hamby, M. Hlebechuk, and W. Hausotter.

**Handouts:**

Agenda: Attachment #1

8/17/04 Selection & Verification meeting minutes: Attachment #2

8/19/04 Adoption & Implementation meeting minutes: Attachment #3

All Stars Program, Draft Application: Attachment #4

Motivational Interviewing, Draft Application: Attachment #5

Draft Process for Selection & Validation of EBPs: Attachment #6

Conference Report & Recommendations: Attachment #7

Consumer Caucus Notes: Attachment # 8

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/ Decision Log	Responsible Persons	Due Date
Introductions	Attendees introduced themselves.			
Review notes from 8/17/04 meeting	Jon distributed the minutes from the last Selection & Validation meeting as well as the EBP Adoption & Implementation meeting for review.			
Consumer Caucus Recommendations- Drake Ewbank	<p>Dianne Duerscheidt and R.D./Drake Ewbank presented the Summary and Recommendations of the June 4, 2004 conference (Evidence-based and Emerging Best Practice Conference).                      Dianne reviewed the seven areas of recommendations and a list of concerns.                      Drake reviewed the work and notes from the consumer caucus.                      The recommendations include but are not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “All "coercive" methods need to be re-examined.“</li> <li>▪ “Create an all-consumer council that would have the authority to approve or veto each EBP suggested for implementation by OMHAS.”</li> <li>▪ “Spread resources equally across the state.”</li> <li>▪ “Initial concern about move to EBP, but rhetoric so far by OMHAS has been positive”</li> </ul>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ “EBPs need to be understood by regular doctors as well as mental health providers.”</li> </ul>
Lines of Communication	Jon reiterated the role of each work group in the EBP process.
Review of Application Prototype	Jon reviewed and explained the draft application. After all recommendations have been made by staff and the review committee the final decision will be up to Bob Nikkel & Madeline Olson as to whether the program is evidence-based. Workgroup members expressed the importance of having all the information available on the web. Jon stressed that any feedback from the workgroup on the application prototype would be very appreciated.
Further Review of the Validation Process	The group discussed the validation process. The goal would be for all approved programs to be posted on the web with measurement tools available. It would be up to the provider to do the criteria. Tracking outcomes will give the providers a foundation to prove any practice.
Comments on Outcomes	If the goal is to have evidence-based practices implemented throughout the state, then the role of the state should lean more towards quality improvement. All EBPs have outcomes associated with them. The state needs reassurance that these are being tracked at some level. The workgroup stressed the importance of communicating changes/updates to criteria, etc. Barbara Friesen added that it would be helpful to see a list of practices that have been determined to be levels 4, 5 and 6.

Next Meeting: