



## SHIP SUBCOMMITTEE MEETING

Bias       Trauma       Economic Drivers       Access to Care     

### Behavioral Health

**October 25th, 2019 | 1:00 pm – 3:00 pm. |**

**Members Present:** Carly Hood, Brenda Bateman, Julie Maher, Bill Baney, Brian Frank, Cord van Riper, Courtney Crowell, Emilegih Canales, Jacob Fox, Lucia Ramirez, Michelle Thurston, Tameka Brazile, Tammy Baney, Victoria Warren-Mears, Sam Engle

**Members Absent:** Alan DeLaTorre, Connor McDonnell, Kim Sogge, Myra Rosales, Sara Beaubein, Caitlin Baggot-Davis, (Chris Baker – no longer on subcommittee)

**OHA Staff:** Heather Owens, Cara Biddlecom, Stephanie Jarem, Trilby Dejung, Carolina Iraheta Gonzalez, Julie Maher.

**Public:** Deborah Riddick (ONA)

### Meeting Recording:

<https://transcripts.gotomeeting.com/#/s/9d5ebb1744e7b9581c5767c637fb2c3d3752346dd51332f5b17ae18818f4f4>

### AGENDA ITEM #1 – Welcome, introductions and follow-up from last meeting

Trilby opened the meeting and identified present participants.

In response to a question about the role of a delegate from our last meeting she clarified that while member attendance is preferred when a delegate is needed, they should be representative of the same organization and constituents served. In regard to consensus process; let's make sure that it includes discussion and that we allow discussion for those who have a thumbs sideways or thumbs down.

To add depth and an opportunity to this work and folks from this committee may be engaged to provide feedback, collaborate and share information representing your specific sectors. This will take place through the end of the year. Trilby asked about how this will be operationalized. Cara explained that PHD staff currently participating on a subcommittee will reach out to ask folks how to best facilitate a shared space for information sharing across sectors and subcommittees.

December meeting needs to be moved, dates proposed are December 20th and January 9<sup>th</sup>. Group landed on December 20<sup>th</sup> 1-3pm.

## **(8:46) AGENDA ITEM #2 – Finalizing the Goals**

Trilby led a discussion about the language used in this process. She clarified that the goal is a broad statement of what we are trying to accomplish to achieve vision, lofty, aspirational. Goal identified by the group in the last meeting was restated sans the time frame “Oregon will be a place where health and wellbeing are achieved across the lifespan for people of all races, ethnicities, disabilities, genders, sexual orientations, socioeconomic status, nationalities and geographic locations.”

Trilby restated the process of what happens after a goal is identified. Stating that the group will then talk about outcome measures to identify progress toward the goal, then get more specific about strategies before moving on to indicators for those strategies – this is where we will see more of that *smart* kind of thinking (referencing *SMART goals*)- and then finally talking about specific tasks. An example of this framework was brought up asked for feedback and reactions and talk through it.

Stephanie stated that as someone who had concerns to goal not being *smart* as well as its broad nature, that this framework alleviated some of her initial concerns. Carolina felt the goal was too broad but thought this could be a goal in progress. She thinks a broad goal for the general subcommittee is a good idea and that the workgroup goals would sit underneath.

Trilby agreed.

Brian had concerns of stating a goal that is unachievable by default letting us off the hook due to our inability to meet it. This opened a conversation about the timeline to meet the goal leading to the group decision to drop the date from the goal. Cara gave perspective of the 5-year SHIP being an overarching timeframe stating that SHIP’s are ambitious and not all goals will be achieved in a 5-year time frame, but the aim is to show progress toward this goal and have measurable wins within this timeframe. Bill agreed that having a lofty goal that is clearly articulated will work if there are short, intermediate and long-term indicators to illustrate that you are moving towards it.

Trilby proposed that the group drops the “by 2020” language from the goal and asked if there were any members who were in the middle or opposed to dropping the date. Emily asked for clarification, wondering if dropping the date would make the goal broader and visionary.

The group decided to drop the time constraint from the goal, landing on this finalized goal:  
“Oregon will be a place where health and wellbeing are achieved across the lifespan for people of all races, ethnicities, disabilities, genders, sexual orientations, socioeconomic status, nationalities and geographic locations.”

The group reviewed other subcommittee goals. The question came up of whether other groups had a sub-goal/workgroup approach to their committees. Cara responded that other groups were using a similar approach. Trilby opened the floor to questions about to other groups goals then moved on to opening the floor to workgroups to share out their goals.

Trilby invited the workgroups to report out their goals and thanked everyone for finding the time to meet and work through this.

(25:45) Cost of caregiving – Steph, Tammy and Caitlin. Tammy reviewed a document in their basecamp defining their scope, definitions and goal.

Goal: Improve the health of all individuals and families in Oregon by ensuring they have access to high-quality, culturally responsive, affordable care giving services and supports when needed, from birth to death and when life demands it.

Tammy stated the group talked a lot about not restricting to just child care, but a broad umbrella from birth to end of life. In light of groups definition of family from Family Leave Act, Trilby talked about Family Leave Act as an indicator – not many people can afford to use it. Carolina added that keeping in mind the nuance of equity and disparities in this context is important. Bill asked if there was discussion about being culturally inclusive and if that could be included. Steph like that.

(32:12) Economic Viability- Emileigh, Brian, Brenda, Carly, Courtney and Sam.

Goal: By December 2024, increase the percentage of Oregonians earning a livable wage by raising public awareness of the correlation between health and economic sufficiency and advocating for evidence-based policies to improve economic sufficiency by December 2024.

Carolina asked if Oregonians are included. Cara suggested using "people in Oregon".

Conversation ensued about “living/working” language in regard to our scope and this potentially including people and outcomes outside of Oregon’s SHIP and to what level of specificity should the goal be laid out in. Should it should be loftier? Trilby offered that we would be able to revisit goal language further along in the process based on strategies the come.

Steph wondered if this is inconsistent with Cost of Caregiving by laying out the strategies within the goal.

Brian - we're using a time 5 years in the future, given the history of wage issues, we don't want to say we can do more. Also, our job isn't to DO this work, but to advocate.

Carly - some of the specificity is due to how lofty the overarching goal is.

Bill - this is more of a strategy and how to operationalize; if we keep it lofty, it increases our flexibility.

Brian - process question around who's carrying out this work. Do we, "as a SHIP" go and lobby and advocate for these?

Cara responded that we want to be bold in our strategies and if we can't individually advance specific strategies ourselves that we would be able to look to other sectors to help us do that. Ultimately, that we shouldn't restrict to what we think we can accomplish but to focus on what will get us to the goal. The bigger hope is that each organization involved in this process would want to have a part implementation of the SHIP as well.

(52:25) Food Insecurity- Tameka, Cord, Emileigh, Michelle, Victoria

Trilby read the goal and open discussion.

Goal: To increase equitable access to culturally appropriate nutritious food regardless of social or structural barriers (e.g., age, location or employment) by addressing the underlying issues in food availability and stigma associated with food insecurity

Shifted to: The goal is to increase equitable access to culturally appropriate nutritious food by addressing stigma associated with food insecurity and the social and structural barriers to food availability.

The group discussed the inclusion of stigma. Michelle spoke on behalf of the group and agreed with the changes in goal language.

(1:00:45) Physical Environment- Cara, Carolina, Kim, Mayra, Cord, Jacob, Lucia, Michelle

Goal: All people in Oregon live, work, and play in a safe and healthy environment and have equitable access to stable, safe, affordable housing, transportation and other essential infrastructure so that they may live a healthy and resilient life.

Heather began report out for the group, sharing draft goals from basecamp. Robust conversation ensued regarding how to fit climate change into this topic with creating an unachievable goal. Cara suggested that we use climate change as a decision lens for the SHIP.

Carolina shared her attempts to combine ideas from all into one single goal. The group liked the inclusion of “healthy and resilient” ultimately leading the group to land on the goal stated above.

Lucia echoed the need to have climate change in the overarching SHIP framework, so all groups are contextualizing recommendations within their priority areas. It was decided to take this to the Core group meeting.

### **(1:18:30) AGENDA ITEM # 3 - Identifying the Key Indicators**

Tammy opened this topic by reviewing the slide explaining proposed process for outcome measure development. Moving on to proposed outcome measure criteria.

Tammy asked about feasibility and opened for discussion. Trilby clarified that each workgroup will only identify 1-2 indicators instead of 2-3 mentioned on a slide due to the sub-priorities areas in our group.

Steph conveyed Caitlin’s typed comments - to include alignment with current practice and usefulness for ultimate purpose of SHIP in the outcome measure criteria.

Julie wants the group to keep thinking about the level of the data being used. Sometimes a need for more granular data exists in order to see change and depending on the interventions.

Trilby tied this to usefulness criteria and thought to take it back to the core group for consideration to add to criteria.

Bill asked if there was room for intermediate outcome measures. Offering that we have short, intermediate and long term. Trilby responded that we will stick to short term and long term and that the challenge is going to be limiting ourselves to a few indicators from the list proposed.

Moving on to review of potential indicators and paring down. Trilby directed the question of whether we should pass this task on to the workgroups or discuss in the larger group. Cara suggested that this gets passed on to the workgroups, identifying gaps that the workgroups are better equipped to take on.

The group continued to discuss possible resources and the challenges that the workgroups will face identifying these measures offering suggestions of methods and resources to consider moving into this next step of indicator identification.

#### **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Jamal signed up for public comment but had left prior to that portion of the agenda.

#### **NEXT STEPS**

1. Members will continue to review Basecamp and contribute to basecamp discussions.
2. Workgroups will schedule a meeting to finalize goals and discuss possible indicators.

#### **ADJOURN**

Next meeting is November 22, 2019