



## Outline of Presentation to MHSOAC – March 22, 2012:

### NAMI California Perspectives on Proposals re

#### Restructuring of State Mental Health

#### I. Opportunities

- a. Success of new realignment depends significantly on strengthened involvement of clients and family members at local level
- b. Changes aimed at integrating systems toward whole health = chance to infuse MHSA values beyond mental health
- c. Movement toward integrated mental health services regardless of funding stream = chance to spread recovery vision throughout
- d. Emphasis on outcomes important in developing comprehensive framework for evaluation focused on quality improvement to inform future planning

#### II. Dangers

- a. Rapid pace of proposed changes not client and family driven
- b. Policy proposals fast-tracked to budget committees
  - i. Last year AB 100 – Dismantling of Department of Mental Health and state review and approval of MHSA Plans
  - ii. This year – proposal to delete Annual Performance contracts, which was last year's promise of accountability.
    1. Annual Performance Contracts were centerpiece of AB 100 Workgroup recommendations
      - a. Priority 3 – mechanism to assure county compliance with MHSA values to replace state review and approval
        - i. Removal would impact corrective authority (see proposed deletion of WIC Section 5897(d))
      - b. Priority 8 – Clarify role and purpose of mental health services performance contract
        - i. Group sanctions it as vehicle for implementing MHSA programs and calls for strengthened language to emphasize stakeholder involvement and cultural competency requirements
      - c. Priority 10 – Identify effective local process which assures counties will meaningfully consider stakeholder input
        - i. Group recommends strengthening language emphasizing qualitative stakeholder engagement
        - ii. Group recommends tying compliance with statewide standards of stakeholder process to regulations and contract requirements
        - iii. Effort to help fulfill this recommendation by a statewide stakeholder group

- iv. Without contracts – no clear mechanism to enforce compliance
- d. Priority 11 – Identify an effective process to make sure county plans comply with the law.
  - i. Again performance contracts were identified - as the means to implement MHSA programs under WIC 5897(c)
  - ii. Deliverables of contract should include MHSA county plan and stakeholder process
  - iii. Group agreed performance contract must be effectively monitored by state entity
- 2. Not clear why State DMH, as a member of the AB 100 Workgroup would assert that performance contracts are no longer of any use.
  - a. It appears that the proposed budget trailer bill language has been based on this assertion

### III. Continuing concerns

- a. Need for clear and centralized venues for client and family stakeholder involvement in statewide mental health as functions are dispersed to 5 different state departments
  - i. Input into policy development – rules and regulations, training and technical assistance
- b. Dept. of State Hospitals – this population should not be further stigmatized and isolated, but stay connected to community mental health to facilitate transition back to their communities.
- c. Funding to counties needs to be attached to a mechanism for accountability to MHSA at the state level
- d. Plan approval – with plan approval proposed to occur solely at the local level with final approval by Boards of Supervisors, protections for the interests of client and family stakeholders must be in place
  - i. Ensuring stakeholder process occurs and plan meets their approval – more extensive than simple 30-day posting
  - ii. Purpose for submitting to OAC should be clarified
    - 1. We urge that this include authority to check to make sure plan meets with stakeholder approval, that an inclusive process was achieved, and other elements comply with MHSA values and law
    - 2. If problems with plan, there must be appropriate remedies
- e. Outcome reporting -Needs to be linked to an accountability mechanism
  - i. Needs to be consistent across counties to best inform evaluation
  - ii. Budget trailer bill language proposes deleting all subsections re performance contracts – including one specifically tying performance contract to data and reporting requirements: WIC 5651(a)(7), “That the county shall provide all data and information set forth in Sections 5610 and 5664.”

### IV. Despite significant concerns – optimistic that it is not too late to prioritize client and family member perspectives. Only working together – as outlined by MHSA – can we make lasting improvements to our mental health system.