

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION (MHSOAC)
Evaluation Committee
California Institute for Mental Health
2125 19th Street, 2nd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
May 23, 2012
1:30 P.M. to 4:30 P.M.**

Committee Members Present:

Richard Van Horn, Chair
Stephanie Oprende*
Viviana Criado*
Debbie Innes-Gomberg
Tim Smith
Denise Hunt
Karyn Dresser
Steve Leoni
Rusty Selix
Kathleen Derby
Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola*
Stephanie Welch
Toby Ewing
Dawn Williams*
Donna Ewing Marto*

Staff:

Carol Hood
Sandy Lyon
Deborah Lee
Filomena Yeroshek
Sherri Gauger
Kevin Hoffman

Other Attendees:

Larry Poaster, Chair MHSOAC
Molly Brassil
Wayne Clark*
Joan Meisel
Raul Sanchez*

*Participated via telephone

Welcome/Introductions

Commissioner Van Horn convened the meeting at approximately 1:41 p.m.

- All meeting participants introduced themselves, and stated their membership affiliation.
- Commissioner Van Horn welcomed everyone and thanked them for their participation on the Evaluation Committee and outlined the agenda for the meeting.

Review and Approve Prior Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved as written.

Update on Evaluation Activities

Staff provided an update of the current evaluation activities and future evaluation activities for the use of the \$875K in FY 2011-12 evaluation resources.

- Highlights of the update:
 - The current contract with UCLA will be amended to expand Priority Indicator reports to be due by September 30, 2013 and March 31, 2014 and transfer the knowledge to state staff on the process to complete the reports. The Commission approved the use of additional administration funding at the May 10, 2012 teleconference for the contract expansion.

- The following UCLA deliverables are pending contract amendments to revise the deliverable submission due dates.
 - Priority Indicator Reports—
 - Draft State level report on priority indicator for most recent year for stakeholder input to be provided by 6/30/12
 - Final state and county level reports on indicators for most recent year includes stakeholder input provided by 9/30/12
 - Second county and state level report to be provided by 3/31/13. This report was revised from quarterly reporting to bi-annual.
 - Analysis of MHSA Expenditures Report--
 - An updated summary of expenditures with cost analyses based on critical questions from Full Service Partnership (FSP) indicators to be provided by 11/30/12.
 - FSP Cost/Cost offset Reports--
 - Draft report on per person FSP costs and cost/offset analysis for stakeholder input due by 6/30/12. These report will analyze the impact of outcomes achieved in comparison to expenditures for FSPs that includes cost/client for all age groups and cost offset for one group.
 - Final report on per person FSP costs and cost/offset analysis that includes stakeholder input due by 9/30/12
- The following is an update on the CSUS deliverables/contract.
 - Four regional trainings on data analysis and FAQs will be provided by 5/24/12. The training videos are to be provided by 6/29/12 and will possibly be available for posting to the DMH website.
 - All regional trainings are to be completed by 6/29/12 for the DCR and data analysis.
- The following is an update of the status of priorities for use of \$875K in FY 2011-12 evaluation resources.
 - The MHSOAC received no viable proposals for the Early Intervention and Reducing Disparities in Access RFPs.
 - At the May 10th Teleconference the Commission authorized the Executive Director to negotiate a contract with a California State University, or University of California, or other entity that has the qualifications listed in each RFP for the amount approved by the Commission in November 2011. MHSOAC Staff have reached out for proposals for both contracts to be executed by June 30, 2012 to encumber available funding.
 - The Commission approved the additional funding to expand the CSUS Interagency Agreement for data improvement to support the

Data Collection and Reporting (DCR) system that includes the following:

- Adds one additional year to the contract
- Adds \$296,500 for the additional deliverables
- Provides the following additional deliverables:
 - Statewide data quality correction plan for improving DCR
 - Regional trainings on how to analyze FSP assessment measures
 - Additional county and statewide data quality reports which capture new time frames
- The following is an update of the status of transfer of Information Technology Systems.
 - As of May 9th, Aaron Carruthers met with DMH CIO Jamie Mangram and DHCS CIO, Chris Cruz to discuss transfer of systems and was assured that the transfer of the CSI and DCR systems will happen after the budget is signed and will most likely be in late summer.
 - It was noted there is to be no down time of system operation because the transfer will happen over a weekend so full access to the MHOAC's contractors should be continuously available
- Public comment was received and incorporated in with the Committee member discussion.

Discussion Regarding Current and Future Efforts to Make the Evaluation Reports More Available So They Can Be Used to Better Support MHSOAC's Role in Oversight and Accountability

Staff led the discussion regarding the current efforts that have been made to make the evaluation reports more available for use to better support the Commission's role in oversight and accountability and the future efforts to come. Highlights of the discussion:

- A recommendation was made regarding the order of headers listed on the home site that should be in the same order as the related links on the side
- Reference should be made as to who the reports are by and the date of the report.
- It was noted there should be an Evaluation 101 to show how the evaluations fit together and to add a disclaimer that they are MHSOAC funded.
- It was suggested that recommendations in the reports could have a guide available that shows how they can be located within the reports.
- A recommendation was made to provide links to other available reports such as funding reports that have relative relationships. An example

noted the Evaluation Master Plan could serve as a template depending on how it's organized, once it becomes available.

- A comment noted when navigating the cursor to hover on the header bar to drop it down to select a topic to open, it is not easily accessible and it was suggested to be modified to improve accessibility
 - It was noted that the Commission will be redesigning the entire website through an Interagency Agreement with DGS
 - A comment was made that some of the reports don't have dates and it was recommended to add dates so it's known when they were completed
 - A recommendation was provided to have an orientation section for the media with quick facts
 - A suggestion was made to include a media tab to be helpful on the overall page so key findings from the reports that are meaningful can be highlighted as significant take-aways
 - Regarding the Fact Sheets, it was noted that they should be available under the specific category and also under the Fact Sheet header
 - It was suggested to place all the Power Points available regarding Evaluations to the specific category
- Public comment was received and incorporated in with the Committee member discussion.

Initial Discussion of the Evaluation Master Plan

Dr. Joan Meisel, contractor for the MHSOAC provided an overview of the proposed overall approach and phases of the work plan that included the steps for the development of the Evaluation Master Plan that the Committee provided input on. Highlights of the presentation:

- Joan will assist the MHSOAC determine an evaluation plan for a reasonable time span, of up to five years, to be in place within the current context of what is happening in the environment that is very uncertain
- The needs and purpose of the use of the plan are very different depending on the perspective of how it will be useful and this is a challenging factor to consider in the development of the master plan.
- Some additional challenges that Joan identified include the following:
 - There is a lot of information available but it is not being used
 - There are multiple efforts currently going on and a lack of coordination among all those major efforts that makes it hard to determine how useful they will be
 - There are challenges with the data and available data systems that are not adequately supported due to costs and the uncertainty of transition responsibilities
 - The data sources that cover segments of the population aren't reported in well coordinated systems
 - The IT environment is changing rapidly so it may be better to consider a more sophisticated effort now in consideration with the fiscal pressures so coordination can make use of available resources when analyzing how to be strategically focused

- The guiding principles in the development of the master plan need to be understood in a general way of where the plan is going and should be done incrementally with continuous feedback so it's inclusive of everything that needs to get done so it goes forward that way.
- Joan has started an inventory of what's been done regarding all activities so there is a grand picture to start the process of information gathering. She is interviewing key informants, summarized accuracy of data systems, considered costs in other states, and is determining how much should be spent going forward within a timeline by the end of the year.
- In consideration of options of how best to frame the activities and who should be responsible, Dr. Meisel is depending on data sources and evaluations currently underway and their success, in addition to what has worked before, to determine these elements of the plan.

Highlights of the discussion:

- A comment was made when considering activities in other states that the quality improvement tool that is a collaborative arrangement needs to be in logical steps that make sense so the recommendations process of what's been happening, through the National Association State Mental Health Program Directors (NASMHPD) is clear.
- It was recommended that an integrated level of care be provided with outcomes that are permanently measureable from county to county when considering Full Service Partnership data.
- A recommendation was made that when other states are consulted it is important that what is asked reflects the effects of the state and links can be provided of good states to contact.
- It was suggested that researchers, statisticians, and stakeholders be contacted for their state of the art wisdom which can have a significant impact on outcomes.
- Joan noted the evaluation master plan is not that specific to be the type of plan with outcomes of who will be measured, what is to be collected, or to actually do that work, is what the plan is not.
- A recommendation was provided that the Department of Corrections and Rehabilitation and the State Water Resources Control Board have evaluation teams that should be consulted with in addition to the Performance Management Council who offer leadership roles in this area.
- It was noted that access to data merging for the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), as an independent entity without a shared understanding is important, which is different from the AB 2034 model that required resources at the county level to be available for other county efforts. The more that realignment occurs it's important that the levels between the Commission, counties and DHCS are able to merge systematically.
- It was recommended to utilize a logic model or other tool for evaluation purposes and that the NASMHPD could provide key informant information to consider, such as examples in Connecticut, Massachusetts, and Maryland that have good cohesive plans. In addition, the NAMI national has a score card for national level data systems to consider.

- A suggestion was provided to consider the Master Plan developed by the California Mental Health Planning Council as a resource guide to compare costs of statewide efforts specific to the scope of projects and services by doing a strategic analysis to compare interoperability of the entire system
 - An evaluation of Innovation was recommended to identify counties that aren't doing well at producing long term outcomes that are needed to serve as process measures to evaluate client outcomes
- Public comment was received and incorporated in with the Committee member discussion

Update on CalMHSA's Evaluation of the PEI Statewide Projects

Stephanie Welch, representing CalMHSA provided a presentation regarding CalMHSA's evaluation of the PEI Statewide Projects that include Suicide Prevention, Improving Student Mental Health, and Reduction of Mental Health Stigma and Discrimination.

- Highlights of the presentation:
 - The CalMHSA's Statewide Evaluation Experts (SEE) role is to provide advice and guidance in the development of the Statewide Evaluation Strategic Plan which include advising on results and provides assistance with interpreting data, communication and implications
 - The evaluation approach being used specific to data has a goal to avoid duplication and excessive burden to counties. A timeline will soon become available that can be provided to the Committee with relevant dates of what is to come.
 - The Suicide Prevention evaluation is focusing on outcomes such as education, knowledge and attitudes used to evaluate programs to create a society that knows suicide is preventable.
 - The Stigma and Discrimination Reduction evaluation efforts are the first in the United States to study and provide recommendations of what to do to reduce stigma. A control group is needed to act as a Litmus Test tool to research usefulness of media interventions to change views and provide training opportunities to educate and promote effectiveness.
 - There is \$8M funding available for the evaluation efforts.
- Highlights of the discussion:
 - A comment was provided that the Statewide Project evaluation should consider building on representing a larger whole that is inclusive of the Evaluation Master Plan.
 - A comment was made that the Statewide Project evaluation is a complex project that has great potential to be useful broadly.
 - A comment noted that it is important to consider the California Reducing Disparity Projects and how this evaluation effort relates to their master plan, specific to the factors for those interested in these areas, if appropriate.
- Public comment was received and incorporated in with the committee member discussion.

Decide on Next Steps Regarding Recommendations from UCLA Reports

Staff led the discussion regarding recommendations from UCLA Report, “Summary and Synthesis of Existing Evaluations Regarding MHSA Values and PEI” that included draft next steps proposed by MHSOAC staff for consideration.

Highlights of the discussion:

- A recommendation was provided to expand MHSA values on positive recovery as the evaluations progress
- The UCLA report is consistent regarding MHSA values, but doesn't necessarily address the impact of MHSA values on the community collaboration process and that action should be considered in the future, as a suggestion. It was also recommended to add this action for future potential evaluation investments to be considered for the Evaluation Master Plan and to continue to align this action in the Request for Proposals.
- A recommendation regarding the Statewide Framework/Master Plan was to do something now, through the efforts of RAND, and then later through Joan Meisel's efforts, which was an agreed upon recommendation.
- The Evaluation Funding Priorities recommendation suggested including the reduction of disparities in the Master Plan, and it was agreed upon that this should have an on-going inclusion in evaluations as they progress.

The discussion was not finished due to time constraints.

Topics for Future Agenda Items

- Evaluation Master Plan—continue to provide input on the master plan
- PEI Evaluation Framework—continue to obtain updates on progress regarding development of the RAND PEI Evaluation Framework, contractor with CalMHSA and provide input on the proposed framework
- Begin initial discussion of priority recommendations for use of the \$875K for FY 2012-13 for evaluation resources

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:28 p.m.