ADVISORY COUNCIL AND COORDINATING COMMITTEE

MEETING MINUTES	MAY 17, 2022

ATTENDANCE

Alycia Bayne	Julia Wieczorek	Megan Avallone
Amanda Medina-Forrester	Kandice Cooper	Natasha Moore
Bageshree Cheulkar	Letitia Holloway-Owens	Peri Nearon
Eva Mancheno	Loretta Kelly	Steve Moffett
Jeanne Herb	Lynne Algrant	
Jen Hopkins	Maria Baron	

DOH SENIOR STAFF PRESENTATION RECAP

- Last presentation was in late 2019 (i.e., pre-COVID)
- Earlier today presented update to senior staff on HNJ2030 progress.
- Expecting feedback via email, but Commissioner and other staff mentioned items to add or consider.
- Key point was to alert and prepare DOH staff for their involvement when action plans are developed

ACTION TEAM UPDATES

- **Community Conversations** alignment to Topic Areas - done
- **2020 SHIP progress:**
  - o Steve assessed status of each strategy in SHIP 2020: what's already been done, what's in progress, what hasn't been started
  - o Shared with ACTs
- **CHA/CHIP Alignment:**
  - o Steve in process of going through latest CHAs, CHNAs, and CHIPs to see what is included within priorities, so HNJ2030 aligns with county health depts and hospital systems
  - o Local health depts not asked to do their 3 year assessments due to pandemic, so some content may change in the next review; but HNJ2030 topics are among the top priorities in the community assessments and plans
  - o Maria, Loretta, and Steve meeting with Office of Local Public Health next week to define next steps
  - o Bageshree: For South Jersey, hospitals do CHIPs with health departments as a collaboration; all not-for-profit hospitals are required to do CHNAs, may collaborate with departments
- **Problem Solving 101 Training** (May 12):

- o DOH hosted training for Action Team chairs on how to properly define a problem and get to the root of what's causing it rather than looking at its symptoms.
  - o ACT members in attendance were given templates to use, most helpful for ones with action plans still in development
- **Draft action plans** are due this Friday (5/20)
  - o Some teams are still developing Action Plans but will send what they have.
  - o Suggest AC & CC reviews plans as they are submitted, which will allow time to refine the rubric and course-correct as needed
  - o Currently have action plans from Healthy Eating & Active Living and STIs subcommittees
  - o Healthy Communities did a "reset" and are still working on action plans
  - o Those in attendance agreed to receive and review Action Plans on rolling basis as they are sent
    - ▪ Jeanne: share draft Action Plans using both Teams links and email attachments

REVISED RUBRIC REVIEW

- Maria: Rubric was revised 5/11 to incorporate AC & CC comments. Alycia and Peri contributed to the Padlet in the last day or two and the link is still open for those who have additional comments/feedback.
  - o Language changed for "Disparities" definition to "populations at increased/higher risk for [condition]"
- Jeanne: rubric not intended to be a quantitative tool, but enough for group to collectively review documents and identify areas that need more conversation
- Loretta: changed "Value" to "Timing" and definition slightly, on significance of value of immediate intervention vs delayed response
- Maria: some changes made slightly to the scoring criteria in language for "Disparities" (changing from number of groups to magnitude of disparities) and "Timing" (value of handling right away or address over longer time period)
- Maria: suggested not using "Data" as criteria, but for use in SMART objectives
- Loretta: there was a question about "Scale" – it's referring to statewide issues carrying the most weight
  - o Maria: also refers to if issue is occurring in multiple pockets across the state
- Loretta: the rubric will be tested for the first time with the first couple of action plans, and group can come back and reassess if there are issues with interpretation, and modify if necessary
- Maria: how do we feel about not using "Data" to assess the strategies? Measurable objectives will be a separate round where Data criteria may come into play
  - o Jeanne: what's the extent to which ACTs will be identifying availability? Logically if ACTs not thinking of data availability a lot, we shouldn't include it in the rubric

- o   Maria: sent out a spreadsheet to ACTs asking about what data sources have been looked at, only a few responses so far. In terms of deciding if a strategy is important, not sure we should judge based on data availability
- Alycia: is rubric is to assess the strategy itself?
  - o   Maria: yes, assesses how they're planning to implement the strategy
- Maria: Remove data for this round and come back to later in SMART objectives? Overall seems to be agreement from group to take out for now
  - o   Jeanne: agree to remove
  - o   Alycia: agree to remove, will require such a comprehensive assessment of data. If trying to move state forward, can't judge strategies based on data availability at least initially
  - o   Bageshree: agree, same thoughts. Eventually want to know if there's data available or not but remove to begin with
  - o   Eva: keeping it for now makes sense because need to figure out moving forward how data will be utilized

NEXT STEPS

- Maria: will send out draft Action Plans – post to Teams, send links, and send as attachments
  - o   In lieu of action plans for ACTs still developing, may help for AC & CC to review meeting minutes
- Maria will send out updated rubric