

# Looking to the Future

National Objectives Work Group

April, 2007


# Workgroup


- Functions as an advisory group to the DDT to discuss national objectives
- Has met almost weekly by phone since August 2006

# Participants from CDC & RTI

- CDC
  - Qaiser Mukhtar
  - Liping Pan
  - Nilka Rios-Burrows
  - Denise Glover
- RTI
  - Erika Fulmer
  - Alton Dunlap
  - Katherine Treiman







# Workgroup Charges

- Review current objectives
- Review potential objectives
- Develop criteria to assess objectives

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Your Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>

Criterion	Description	Your Rating	Comments
<b>Evidence base</b>	Extent to which you believe that the peer reviewed literature supports use of the objective.		

**Evidence-Based**

Criterion	Description	Your Rating	Comments
<b>Evidence base</b>	Extent to which you believe that the peer reviewed literature supports use of the objective.		
<b>Feasibility</b>	Extent to which you believe the objective can be reliably and precisely measured given existing data availability, especially at the state level.		

**Feasibility**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Your Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Evidence base</b>	Extent to which you believe that the peer reviewed literature supports use of the objective.		
<b>Feasibility</b>	Extent to which you believe the objective can be reliably and precisely measured given existing data availability, especially at the state level.		
<b>Mutability</b>	The ability for DPCPs to influence a given objective		
	<b>Mutability</b>		

Criterion	Description	Your Rating	Comments
<b>Evidence base</b>	Extent to which you believe that the peer reviewed literature supports use of the objective.		
<b>Feasibility</b>	Extent to which you believe the objective can be reliably and precisely measured given existing data availability, especially at the state level.		
<b>Mutability</b>	The ability for DOGs to influence the objective.		
<b>Consistency with National Policy Objectives</b>	The objective is aligned with other national policy objectives such as Health People 2010.		

**Consistency with National Policy**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Your Rating</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Evidence base</b>	Extent to which you believe that the peer reviewed literature supports use of the objective.		
<b>Feasibility</b>	Extent to which you believe the objective can be reliably and precisely measured given existing data availability, especially at the state level.		
<b>Mutability</b>	The ability for UICF to influence the given objective		
<b>Consistency with National Policy Objectives</b>	The objective is aligned with other national policy objectives such as Health People 2010.		
<b>Room for Improvement</b>	The current rates for the given objective allow for improvement.		

**Room for Improvement**

# Examples of Potential Objectives Reviewed

- Diabetes education
- Aspirin therapy
- Depression screening
- Oral health
- Blood pressure control

# Proposed Recommendations

- Increase recommended physical activity rates among people with diabetes
- Decrease smoking rates among people with diabetes
- Continue to improve rates of 2+ annual A1C exams

# Additional Recommendations

- Advocate for reporting gestational diabetes on birth certificates
- Enhance surveillance opportunities
  - **Move from process objectives to outcome objectives**
  - **Explore options between CB and BI DPCPs**

# Keys to Implementation

- Identify resources
- Identify partners and enhance partnerships
- Conduct literature review
- Identify best practices and success stories
- Operationalize definitions and information
- Seek input

# Thanks to CDC, RTI, and State Participants

- Robin Edelman – Vermont
- Jenny Camponeschi – Wisconsin
- Sandra Flynn – South Carolina
- Gwen Hosey – CDC Public Health Advisor for Nevada
- Mike Friedrichs – Utah
- Brenda Ralls – Utah

Thank you!