

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES  
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION (MHSOAC)  
Evaluation Committee  
California Institute for Mental Health  
2125 19<sup>th</sup> Street, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Sacramento, CA 95811  
February 22, 2012  
1:30 P.M. to 4:30 P.M.**

**Committee Members Present:**

Richard Van Horn, Chair  
David Pating, Vice Chair  
Viviana Criado  
Debbie Innes-Gomberg  
Tim Smith\*  
Denise Hunt  
Karyn Dresser  
Steve Leoni  
Rusty Selix\*  
Kathleen Derby  
Karen Stockton  
Stephanie Welch  
Jane Adcock\*

**Staff:**

Sandy Lyon  
Deborah Lee  
Filomena Yeroshek  
Sherrri Gauger  
Kevin Hoffman  
Aaron Carruthers  
Enrica Bertoldo  
Carol Hood

**Other Attendees:**

Jim Gilmer  
Sarah Brichler  
Sandra Marley  
Elizabeth Harris\*  
Cecilia Badger  
Molly Brassil  
Sandra Marley

\*Participated via telephone

**Welcome/Introductions**

Commissioner Van Horn convened the meeting at approximately 1:34 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 the update of evaluation activities that are current and those scheduled for completion this year.

- Highlights of the update:
  - The three following deliverables have been completed since the last committee meeting.
    - Standardized Template for Reports on Priority Indicators and the Process for Compiling Data that Includes Stakeholder Input for Statewide County Reporting.
    - A summary and synthesis of existing evaluations and studies with a focus on the impact of the MHSA on consumer outcomes and

- MHSAs values including recommendations for next steps and resources.
    - Using Participatory Research, Deliverables 2a1 and 2a2, specify one GSD service strategy, and one client outcome prioritized from MHSAs, and describes the methodology used, including any new data collection. The report also includes the impact of the involvement of clients and family members in the public mental health system on outcomes prioritized from the MHSAs.
  - There are deliverables that have revised submission due dates because of data issues that are listed below.
    - Analysis of MHSAs Expenditures report to be provided by 9/30/12 as an updated summary of expenditures with cost analyses based on critical questions from Full Service Partnerships (FSP) indicator deliverables.
    - Draft state level report on priority indicators for most recent year for stakeholder input provided by June 30, 2012.
    - Final state and county level reports to be provided by 3/31/13
    - Cost/Cost Offset-Draft report on per person FSP costs and cost/offset analysis for at least one of the four age groups for stakeholder input due by 6/30/12
    - Final FSP Cost/Cost Offset report that includes stakeholder input due by 9/30/12
  - The Commission approved the Evaluation Committee recommendations for use of the \$875,000 in FY 2011-12 evaluation resources at the November 17<sup>th</sup> meeting. RFPs will be released in March seeking proposals for the Reducing Disparities in Access and the Early Intervention evaluations. The CSUS contract will be amended to expand the data quality efforts.
  - A comment noted the community planning process should also be evaluated
- Public comment was received and incorporated in with the Committee member discussion.

**Discuss Draft 2012 Evaluation Committee Work Plan to Accomplish the Committee Charter**

Staff led the discussion regarding the Evaluation Committee Draft 2012 Work Plan.

Highlights of the discussion:

- The Work Plan is to be a work in progress and will be updated as needed.
- It was recommended that the Evaluation Master Plan work plan item be included only when there are updates available of work that's being done regarding the plan.
- Updates regarding development of the PEI Evaluation Framework by CalMHSAs and its contractor, the RAND Corporation, will be available consistent with the timeline proposed by RAND. This timeline may impact the proposed Work Plan monthly activity schedule.

- Public comment was received and incorporated in with the Committee member discussion.

**Update on PEI Framework being Developed by RAND Corporation, Contractor with CalMHSA**

Staff provided an update and led the discussion regarding the PEI Framework being developed by RAND, under a contract with CalMHSA. The presentation included a summary of the approved Scope of Work from CalMHSA's contract with RAND and key features of the proposed outline that RAND is working on, including the following: Highlights of the update:

- Conceptual model: structure, process, and outcomes
  - Structure—capacity of the state to deliver PEI services and available resources
  - Process—the aggregate use of PEI resources
  - Outcomes—change in knowledge, attitude, beliefs, short term and long-term
- RAND's approach is focusing on the 7 negative outcomes from the MHSA to measure the impact of PEI on populations, and will identify statewide data sources for each of the negative outcomes
- The framework will look at characteristics of populations served by PEI programs and services
- A comment was made regarding the Palette of Measures project led by CiMH which is an evaluation effort by some counties to agree on common measures
- CalMHSA has convened a group of subject matter experts known as the Statewide Evaluation Experts Team (SEE TEAM) that serves in an advisory capacity regarding CalMHSA's/RAND's evaluation of the three statewide PEI projects and the PEI Evaluation Framework

Stephanie Welch, representing CalMHSA presented additional comments regarding updates of the PEI Framework being developed by RAND, contractor for CalMHSA. Highlights of the update:

- The timeline RAND is working towards includes providing a report to the Evaluation Committee at the June 2012 meeting after seeking key informant input on the process
- The key informants are invited to participate as stakeholders to better vet the process and can provide input in March but it is unknown at this time if a document will be available for the April 20<sup>th</sup> Evaluation Committee meeting to review
- A concern was raised that RAND is considering a state level structure and it was recommended to look at zip codes as an option because the state is not a functional unit when considering outcomes, an example noted the CHIS survey which reports by zip code which is an effective model
- The SEE Team is comprised of volunteers as evaluation experts; their meetings are not subject to the Brown Act. CalMHSA has another stakeholder group that holds publicly noticed meetings.

- A suggestion was made for volunteers from the Evaluation Committee to participate as key informants and Karyn Dressor, Commissioners Richard Van Horn and David Pating volunteered to be key informants of the process
- A recommendation was made that in California an inductive approach is preferred rather than deductive so that knowledge can be built on from the ground up in reference to service delivery which did not seem clear in the RAND proposal in response to the California context
- It was recommended that the MHSOAC have more involvement into the process
- A question arose of how key counties were selected by CalMHSA to participate in the SEE Team, and a response noted, through the CMHDA IDEA Committee, with more information to be available at the next Committee meeting of how that worked
- Public comment was received and incorporated in with the Committee member discussion

### **Discuss Preliminary Recommendations for Availability and Usability of Evaluation Efforts**

Staff led the discussion regarding recommendations to expand availability and usability of completed MHSOAC evaluation efforts to support the Commission's role in oversight and accountability.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - A suggestion was made that evaluation documents should be available on the MHSOAC website with a user friendly design that includes a flow chart of how one study leads to another with a tutorial of how to navigate through each summary
  - A recommendation was made to send out press releases or e-mail blasts when the documents are posted for those interested in quality improvement efforts
  - It was recommended that public relations experts be responsible for messaging inclusive of evaluators and MHSOAC staff to help spread the word that reports are available so the appropriate target audience will receive the notices
  - A comment was made that the California Matrix Information that's been developed by CalMHSA's program partners, intended for contract management, is a useful tool to manage all deliverables that may be a strategy to consider
  - A suggestion noted to improve practices, implement an award process that recognizes quality improvement successes by counties that try to build an evaluation culture to move forward to help the system
  - It was noted that CiMH has a learning collaborative led by Jennifer Clancy that could be a model for quality improvement to change the culture and practices that the Services and Evaluation Committees can work together to identify training and technical assistance needs
  - It was stated the Commission should be first to see reports. If any issues arise from its review they should be addressed accordingly with next step considerations as needed

- Public comment was received and incorporated in with the committee member discussion.

### **Brainstorm Ideas for UCLA Regarding Analysis of MHSA Expenditures**

Staff led the discussion regarding development of ideas for UCLA to consider in their MHSA expenditure reports.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - A suggestion was made to provide clarification regarding the cost offset methodology to be clear that as a client improves, the provider pays less and the client and family member takes on more costs whether or not the client becomes employed, etc.
  - A recommendation was provided to reduce use of flex funds as an indicator which will be less expensive unless employment is considered which could account for a shift in the actual numbers
  - It was suggested to go deeper or consider if the cost offset happens early because there s a preponderance by type of service package and menu of services
  - It was noted that UCLA is looking at county wide data down to the client level and that access to data is questionable if enough counties don't participate in the survey. The assessment data varies depending on the county and the demographics can be tied to the data so it is important to do the cost offset that prioritizes costs for FSPs as high

### **Topics for Future Agenda Items**

- An update regarding the PEI Framework and the activities of the SEE Team
- Consider recommendations provided to expand availability and usability of completed evaluation efforts for Committee's feedback
- Evaluation Master Plan

### **Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.