

Meeting Minutes
 Council on Linkages Between Academia and Public Health Practice
Core Competencies Workgroup
 Via Conference Call
 Monday, February 25, 2008, 2:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m. ET

Members Present: Diane Downing, Janet Place, Yolanda Savage, Mark Edgar, John Gwinn, Dawn Gentsch, Catherine Selden, Lisa Lang, Nancy McKenney, Jeanne Matthews

Staff Present: Kathy Miner, Ron Bialek, Ruth Gelles

Agenda Item	Discussion	Next Steps
Brief update of developments since last call	<p>Ruth Gelles briefly outlined the process for updating the Core Competencies for Public Health Professionals, as follows:</p> <p>The Workgroup staff (Kathy Miner, Ron Bialek, and Ruth Gelles) have revised the Core Competencies and made some additions/deletions. Background information has been posted on the Workgroup's website, http://www.phf.org/Link/competencieswg.htm, which should be useful to members.</p> <p>We plan to have two more drafts between now and May 31, 2008, when we will release the draft to the public for comment.</p>	
Brief overview of <i>Construct Validity of the Core Competencies</i> study	<p>Mark Edgar gave a brief summary of his study, an abstract of which is available on the Workgroup's website. The study was conducted in local health departments in Missouri. Generally, the eight domain framework worked well; however, the Communication Domain did not hold up as well as the others. Many of the concerns outlined in the study have been alleviated by the first re-draft. Dr. Edgar suggested that a replication of their study might be an appropriate part of the future process.</p>	
Discuss of draft of revised Core Competencies	<p>Dr. Miner said she thinks that the revised competencies still need work. She mentioned that, like the <i>Construct Validity</i> study showed, the Communications Domain is the most difficult to revise.</p> <p>The group generally agreed that showing the Communications Domain to a few experts in the field may be helpful from a content prospective.</p>	<p>Workgroup members should let staff know the names of anyone who might be an expert in health communication</p>

	<p>Additionally, if the Workgroup has specific questions, these could be compiled and given to the Council on Linkages to discuss during their March 17, 2008 in-person meeting.</p> <p>Some specific concerns were raised:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The ability to use formalized command structure should be included. It is mentioned in the competency “implements emergency response plans,” but is not specifically addressed. Members agreed that an understanding of incident command should be automatic for public health workers and that it is now a <i>core</i> competency for public health workers. <p>There was some discussion of the public health structure varying from state to state and how this would affect the phrasing of this kind of competency. Some members liked the broader wording as it is more widely applicable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Members agreed that we should retain the Essential Public Health Services as a framework for these competencies and that cross-walking should be limited to the Essential Public Health Services in order to keep the final document manageable. - Nancy McKenney raised the issue of informatics being included in a more prominent way. Rather than including it in the Analytic/Assessment domain as “Applies data collection processes, information technology applications, informatics, and computer systems storage/retrieval strategies” perhaps it should be its own competency. <p>Members agreed that informatics could be put into a number of domains.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Janet Place suggested adding “ethics” to the Policy Development/Program Planning Skills Domain competency which reads “Articulates the health, fiscal, administrative, legal, social, 	<p>and would be willing to review the Communications Domain and provide input.</p> <p>Any specific questions the Workgroup has for the Council should be sent to rgelles@phf.org.</p> <p>Staff should contact Dave Ross at the Public Health Informatics Institute regarding the placement and phrasing of an informatics competency.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>and political implications of each policy option.” Dr. Miner agreed that this made sense.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Dawn Gentsch asked if there was a rationale behind using phrases such as “public health programs” vs. “services” and “public health” vs. “community health” in the original drafting and suggested more consistency would make the Core Competencies easier to use. - Ms. Gentsch also suggested that the process of “implementing” something needs to be separated from “planning,” etc. - Ms. Gentsch suggested that a competency outlining the relationship between public health departments and public health laboratories and clinical laboratories should be added. - Ms. Gentsch also suggested that a competency outlining the relationship between health departments and their governing bodies would be useful. - Diane Downing suggested broadening the example of the “mid-tier” worker to include those with degrees other than an MPH, such as an RN or MS. Also the work experience should be specified as <i>public health</i> work experience. - A number of members said they would send comments to the Workgroup via email. - Our view of diversity is broader than what we have. We may want to look at how people are defining minorities, for example “health literacy,” “health equity,” “lifestyle preferences,” “persons of all ages,” etc. - Ms. Gentsch suggested including additional information to provide some groundwork when the final draft is released. 	<p>Dr. Miner will put some wording together that the group can review.</p> <p>Expand definition of “mid-tier.”</p>
Upcoming dates/deadlines	Ms. Gelles briefly outlined the next steps. A new draft should be sent to Council on Linkages members, as well as Workgroup members, by March 10, 2008 to give Council members a chance to review it by the	

	<p>March 17, 2008 in-person meeting.</p> <p>A further draft will be produced based on the comments received from Council members.</p> <p>The Workgroup's final meeting will be April 30, 2008 at which point they will make final comments, which will be incorporated into a final draft for Council approval.</p>	
--	---	--