



PHAST-Tracking Overdose Fatality Review Recommendations:

A Collaborative Implementation Approach through the
Public Health and Safety Team (PHAST) Framework



Presentation Outline and Objectives

- Presentation Outline
 - Welcome and presenter introductions
 - Background: OFR overview and PHAST framework
 - Operationalizing PHAST in Oakland County
 - Key implementation strategies
 - Outcomes and takeaways
- Presentation Objectives
 - Explore strategies for building and sustaining multi-agency partnerships
 - Identify effective methods to foster shared accountability among agencies

Instructions:

Go to www.menti.com

Enter the code
5806 9350





Background

- Overdose Fatality Review overview
- Introduction to the PHAST framework

Overdose Fatality Review Overview

- A model being utilized across the nation to conduct in-depth reviews of fatal overdose cases by multi-disciplinary teams
- Involves use of aggregate and case-level data
- Aims to enhance community-based responses to the overdose crisis through generating recommendations to address needs across systems, agencies, populations, and policies



Image from: <https://www.ofrtools.org>

Why OFR?



Oakland County Overdose Fatality Review

- Established in December 2023 and coordinated by Alliance of Coalitions for Healthy Communities
- Diverse Partners:
 - Medical Examiner, Harm Reduction, Epidemiology, Law Enforcement, EMS, High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area, Mental Health, Hospital, Board of Commissioners, Community Corrections, Prosecutor's Office, Probation, and Circuit Court Judge
- To date: 23 OFR meetings completed, 12 cases reviewed in total, ~50 recommendations

Public Health and Safety Team (PHAST) Overview

- Framework created by the CDC
 - Aim: To assist local jurisdictions in reducing overdose deaths through increased collaboration and coordination across sectors
- Focus is on bridging gaps between public health and public safety



Image from: <https://phast.org>

PHAST Guiding Principles and SOS Goals

- 4 guiding principles
 - Reduce overdose deaths
 - Recognition of Opioid Use Disorder as a Chronic, Treatable Disease
 - Responsible Use of Multi-sector Data to Inform Response Strategies
 - Continuous improvement

- SOS goals



Image from: <https://phast.org>

PHAST Framework:

4 Modules for Moving from Insight to Impact

PHAST Module	Purpose
Module 1: Build or Strengthen Your PHAST	Establish the collaborative structure and relationships needed to implement recommendations
Module 2: Share and Use Data Across Sectors	Align public health and public safety data to inform priorities and identify intervention points
Module 3: Move from Data to Action	Translate OFR recommendations into coordinated, sector-aligned actions
Module 4: Measure Progress and Sustain the Work	Ensure accountability, monitor implementation, and adjust strategies over time

PHAST and OFR

- Guided by the same principles and processes
 - Complementary approach
- Implementation of the public health and public safety subcommittees to further advance the PHAST framework in Oakland County
- Expanding upon partnerships to turn recommendations into action



“Regardless of which comes first, a PHAST and OFR team go hand-in-hand. Ideally one does not exist without the other.”

Instructions:

Go to www.menti.com

Enter the code
5806 9350





Operationalizing PHAST in Oakland County

PHAST in Action: Subcommittee Development

- Structure
 - Public Health and Public Safety Subcommittees (OFR Action Teams)
- Purpose
 - To facilitate coordinated and data-driven action based on OFR recommendations
- Overarching goal
 - To ensure that recommendations that emerge from the OFR are implemented effectively



PHAST Subcommittee Purpose and Goals

- Key activities include:
 - **Reviewing recommendations** - determining feasibility, priority level, and appropriate stakeholder(s) to carry out implementation
 - **Formulating action plans** - developing strategic approaches for implementation, generating short-term and long-term goals, and identifying key resources/stakeholders
 - **Monitoring progress on implementation** – tracking and assessing progress on recommendation implementation, assessing needs for action plan adjustment



Why PHAST?

Addressing Challenges and Creating Opportunities

Challenges	Opportunities
Volume and complexity of recommendations spanning across multiple sectors and areas of expertise	Structured approaches for coordination, improved data sharing, and evidence-informed decision making
Gaps in coordination between sectors → duplication of efforts and missed opportunities for alignment	Enhanced alignment of sectors and coordinated interventions to mitigate siloed approaches
Need for a structured, collaborative approach with a common roadmap and trackable progress	Emphasis on sustainable system change and monitoring to build capacity for continuous improvement
Inconsistencies in accountability and follow-through for implementation without a formal process for establishing ownership and action steps	Shared ownership over recommendations and enhanced clarity of actions for implementation

Oakland County Recommendations

Number of OFR
meetings conducted

23

Number of cases
reviewed through OFR

25

Number of
recommendations
identified

166

Recommendations Identified by Primary Theme:

Communication

18

Data

10

Education and
Training

27

Harm Reduction

16

Outreach and
Collaboration

31

Resource and
Support Access

46

Support for
Justice-Involved
Individuals

7

Treatment

11

A decorative header consisting of a blue bar on top, a green bar on the bottom left, and an orange bar on the bottom right. The text 'Key Implementation Strategies' is centered in white on a green background.

Key Implementation Strategies

Strategies for PHAST-tracking recommendations

- Strategy 1: Clear path from recommendation development to implementation of actions
- Strategy 2: Established process for tracking recommendations and monitoring process
- Strategy 3: Recommendation prioritization to guide areas of focus
- Strategy 4: Coordinated planning and resource alignment
- Strategy 5: Communication and trust-building between agencies

Defining a clear roadmap: From OFR recommendations to implementation (Strategy 1)

Recommendations emerge from OFR



```
graph TD; A[Recommendations emerge from OFR] --> B[Subcommittee review of recommendations list]; B --> C[Recommendation selection]; C --> D[Implementation plan development]; D --> E[Implementation progress follow-up];
```

Subcommittee review of recommendations list

-Assessment of feasibility and priority level of individual recommendations

Recommendation selection

-A few recommendations are selected for in-depth review at monthly subcommittee meeting
-Suggested approach – start with high priority + high feasibility (low hanging fruit) recommendations

Implementation plan development

-Determination of subcommittee point-person, stakeholder(s) for implementation, and development of action plan

Implementation progress follow-up

-Update on progress and/or requests for assistance from subcommittee point person at beginning of subsequent meeting

Monitoring recommendations: Keeping implementation on track (Strategy 2)

- Recommendation tracking via Microsoft Lists
 - All recommendations added after OFR meetings, classified by theme
 - Includes OFR meeting(s) associated with recommendation
 - Information to be updated through subcommittee discussions
 - Prioritization score
 - Recommended action
 - Designated subcommittee for implementation
 - Implementation status (not yet started, in progress, on hold, delayed, completed)
 - Date of last status update
 - Implementation status notes and next steps
 - Additional notes

Prioritizing recommendations: Data-informed scoring process (Strategy 3)

Criteria	1 - Lowest	2 – Medium low	3 - Medium	4 – Medium high	5 - Highest
Resource availability/ accessibility	Resources are sufficient and widely accessible to all	Adequate resources exist and are mostly accessible or barriers exist for some populations	Some resources exist but access is uneven or limited	Few resources exist and are difficult to access for most populations	No resources exist or significant access barriers are present for all or most populations
Urgency/ time sensitivity	Minimal urgency or time sensitivity	Low urgency or time sensitivity	Moderate urgency or time sensitivity	Medium high urgency or time sensitivity	High urgency or time sensitivity
Actionability/ feasibility (i.e. ability to address at local level, connection to necessary stakeholder, barriers for implementation)	Not actionable, major barriers exist and there is little to no local control	Low feasibility, significant barriers exist but may have some actionability at the local level	Some feasibility, moderate barriers but potential for action at the local level	Mostly feasible, likely few barriers and high potential for action at the local level	Highly actionable, clear pathway and strong local control
Existing evidence	Little or no supporting evidence for action	Limited or weak evidence base for action	Moderate evidence base for action	Strong evidence for action	Robust, high-quality evidence strongly supports action
Equity/ reduction of disparities	Unlikely to impact inequities	Minimal impact on inequities	Some potential to reduce disparities	Likely to address key equity issues	Highly likely to directly target and address root causes of inequity

Prioritizing recommendations: Identifying appropriate actions (strategy 3)

Total Score	Priority Level	Interpretation
5–10	Lowest priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Weak alignment with prioritization criteria • Not recommended for subcommittee action at this time without significant changes or new information • May be more appropriately addressed by an external stakeholder
11–15	Low Priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some potential, but limited by factors like feasibility, urgency, or unclear impact • May need further development, support, or re-evaluation before action
16–20	Moderate Priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Meets several key criteria, though may have limitations (i.e. in resources or evidence) • Worth pursuing in near term, possibly after high-priority items or with additional support
21-25	High Priority	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong alignment across all criteria • High level of actionability, urgency, feasibility, need for resources, capacity to address inequities, and strong evidence base • Should be prioritized for immediate planning and implementation

Coordinated planning: Aligning partners and resources (Strategy 4)



- Provide progress updates to inform ongoing planning
- Identify and document existing agency efforts and resources during the recommendation prioritization process
- Recognize opportunities for cross-agency collaboration
- Use partner expertise to guide assignment of roles for implementation

Communication approaches: Fostering trust and transparency in partnerships (Strategy 5)

- Regular opportunities during meetings to create space for open dialogue and shared planning
- OFR Annual Report provides partners and the public with transparent progress and priorities
- OFR webpage serves as a centralized hub for resources, updates, and shared information
- Ongoing communication builds mutual understanding and reinforces shared goals

OFR annual report



OFR webpage



Instructions:

Go to www.menti.com

Enter the code
5806 9350



A decorative header consisting of a blue bar on top, a green bar on the bottom left, and an orange bar on the bottom right. The text "Outcomes and Takeaways" is centered in white on the green bar.

Outcomes and Takeaways

Outcomes: Areas of Successful Implementation

- Expanding Collaborative Strategies and Bridging Connections
 - Related Recommendations
 - Improve data sharing practices across organizations
 - Increase buy-in for data sharing through awareness of OFR
 - Enhance inter-organization collaboration to streamline resource access
 - Implementation progress
 - Broadened OFR membership to incorporate additional perspectives
 - Enriched information acquired for OFR case reviews to improve insights obtained and strengthen recommendation development
 - Improved communication among partner agencies for better coordination
 - Cultivation of new partnerships and collaborations among agencies

Outcomes: Areas of Successful Implementation

- Advancing SUD Support Throughout the Justice System
 - Related Recommendations
 - Incorporate input from formerly incarcerated individuals
 - Develop strategies for enhanced law enforcement interagency collaboration
 - Improve “flagging” of SUD concerns during justice involvement
 - Implementation progress
 - Developed a survey to identify opportunities for improving support for recently incarcerated people, particularly post-release
 - Guided conversations among law enforcement to bridge gaps in coordination
 - Held ongoing discussions on the need for a unified ‘flagging’ approach by law enforcement agencies to support connection to resources

Outcomes: Areas of Successful Implementation

- Strengthening Approaches to Coordination of Services
 - Related Recommendations
 - Address areas of disconnect between the judicial system, peer support, and other support services
 - Develop and distribute a consolidated, streamlined resource flyer
 - Increase awareness of the Oakland County Crisis Response Unit throughout the county
 - Implementation progress
 - Discussed need for communication among key partners and began conversations to reduce barriers
 - Convened key partner agencies to begin curating a simplified list of vital resource access points
 - Distributed information about the Crisis Response Unit to stakeholders throughout the county
 - Identified specific needs for service coordination & conceptualized strategies targeting existing needs

Takeaways:

How PHAST Has Transformed Our Work

- **Structured framework turned insight into action**
 - PHAST frameworks has helped establish a step-by-step process to move from discussion and data to implementation
- **Subcommittees driving momentum as action teams**
 - Action-focused groups created space for in-depth work and consistent progress
- **Building commitment through shared accountability built**
 - Enhanced engagement of Agencies were more engaged with wider distribution fo responsibilities and clear establishment of roles
- **Data-informed prioritization to reduced overwhelm**
 - Prioritization informed by local data and existing efforts to guide focus on high-impact, achievable actions
- **Collaborative ownership matching tasks to areas of expertise**
 - Partners taking on actions aligned with their strengths to streamline implementation

Takeaways:

Considerations for Implementation

- **Identify committed champions**
 - Understand who has capacity and who is positioned to lead implementation work.
- **Leverage existing partnerships where applicable**
 - Build on trusted relationships and collaborative structures already in place
- **Build trust and collaboration intentionally**
 - Relationships take time and consistent engagement to grow
- **Be structured but flexible**
 - Make PHAST work for your local context – the framework is designed to be adaptable and responsive
- **Prioritize strategically**
 - Not every recommendation will be feasible – focus on what aligns with capacity and community needs
- **Plan for sustainability**
 - Balance quick wins with long-term coordination, monitoring, and accountability

Summary and Closing

- Summary of key points
 - PHAST provides a structured yet flexible framework to move from data and discussion to implementation of actions
 - Cross-sector collaboration is strengthened through shared ownership, aligned resources, and data-driven prioritization
 - Established processes like tracking and prioritization of recommendations support sustained action
- Resources and tools
 - OFR toolkits: <https://www.ofrtools.org/toolkits/list>
 - PHAST toolkit: <https://phast.org/>
- Contact info
 - Pepper Catt, Alliance of Coalitions for Healthy Communities – pcatt@alliancemi.org
 - Kaitlin Schwarz, Oakland County Health and Human Services – schwarzk@oakgov.com

Instructions:

Go to www.menti.com

Enter the code
5806 9350





Q&A Session

Thank you for your time!



**OAKLAND
COUNTY**
M I C H I G A N

DAVID COULTER
OAKLAND COUNTY EXECUTIVE

