

MHSOAC
Mental Health Services
Oversight and Accountability Commission
Teleconference Minutes
May 10, 2012

1300 17th Street, Suite 1000
Sacramento, California 95811

1. Call to Order

Chair Poaster called the meeting to order at 9:14 a.m. Chair Poaster thanked the Commissioners for taking the time for the Teleconference. He stated that the items being dealt with were time-sensitive issues that could not wait for the regular May Commission Meeting.

Chair Poaster made a suggestion on how to best resolve the issues at hand. He suggested that the first two items would be a single presentation, then Commissioner Questions, followed by Public Comment, Commissioner Discussion, and finally the Commissioner votes. The last two items would repeat the process. He stated that from a policy perspective, these items have already come through the Commission. These are merely the actions necessary to implement what the Commission has already approved. He then went on to explain the various PowerPoint packets, and how they would work with the meeting's agenda.

2. Roll Call

Commissioners in attendance: Larry Poaster, PhD, Chair; Richard Van Horn, Vice-Chair; Sheriff William Brown; Andrew Poat; Eduardo Vega; David Pating, M.D.; Commissioner Tina Wooton; and Ralph Nelson, Jr. M.D.

Sunday Balalis called in to represent Commissioner Correa.

Eight Commissioners were present and a quorum was established.

3. Consider Recommendation to Authorize Executive Director to Enter into Interagency Agreement /Contract for Early Intervention Evaluation

Chair Poaster turned the meeting over to Vice-Chair Van Horn.

Vice-Chair Van Horn gave a brief overview on what the PowerPoint entailed emphasizing how time-sensitive the meeting's commitments were in that the contracts must be signed by June 30, 2012.

He added that the commitments have been already presumed by the Evaluation Committee. They are part of the \$875,000 that was set aside in addition to some extra money that was discovered having not been spent.

With that said, Vice-Chair Van Horn turned the meeting over to Carol Hood, MHSOAC Staff, for the presentation.

Carol Hood described the issue at hand stating that the Commission has been asked to authorize the use of Evaluation money for FY2011-12 which would allow the Executive Director to enter into an interagency agreement or contract for the evaluation of Reducing Disparities in Access, and an interagency agreement or contract for the evaluation of Early Intervention programs. She stated that the competitive bid process did not produce a viable bidder to perform the evaluations and that the money must be used by the end of the fiscal year (June 30, 2012) or it will be reverted.

Ms. Hood stated the proposed motions. She then gave a brief background stating that in November, 2011, the Commission approved three priorities for use of \$875,000 evaluation funds for FY2011-12 as recommended by the Evaluation Committee. She then went over the approximate costs approved by the Commission and what they included.

A Request for Proposals (RFP) was disseminated on March 21, 2012, for the Reducing Disparities in Access evaluation and on March 23, 2012, for the Early Intervention Program evaluation.

RFPs were sent to over 2,247 subscribers of the California Department of General Services BidSync system, of which 47-48 were downloaded. In addition, the RFPs were distributed to 1,500 subscribers of the MHSOAC's List Serve and posted on the MHSOAC website. Despite this massive outreach, the MHSOAC did not receive any proposals that met the RFP criteria.

Ms. Hood gave a brief summary of how the Scope of Work and Provider Qualifications included in the evaluation of Early Intervention Programs RFPs were developed stating that they were based on the approved priority recommendations. The intended use for this proposal is for consumers and family members, policy makers, and the public.

Highlights of the summary included the following:

- Evaluation will provide information to policy makers and the public to further their understanding about the use and impact of PEI funds.
- Evaluation will provide information for consumers, their family members, and service providers in order to improve early intervention services.

With regards to the negotiations with a university or other entity, the Executive Director would look for an entity that meets the minimum qualifications to provide the deliverables in the Scope of Work specified in the Early Intervention RFP.

The minimum qualifications include:

- Comparable experience in program evaluation and a capacity to manage a project of similar durations and funding.
- Advanced management experience.

- Demonstrated experience in setting up and working with diverse consumers, family members and stakeholder groups.
- Experience in the evaluation of cultural competence (as well as a culturally competent approach to evaluation itself), and reducing mental health disparities.
- Experience in incorporating concepts of client and family resilience and recovery into evaluation.
- Experience in working with public databases including entering into Data Sharing Memoranda of Understandings (MOUs) for access to public data including full Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA) compliance.

Since there was not a successful bid process, staff is looking to potential contractors that could provide the services being sought. They must meet the minimum qualifications specified in the RFP and they must produce the deliverables, also specified in the RFP.

An overview of the desired deliverables was provided as follows:

- 1) Establish a baseline of the investment in Early Intervention- specifically how much is being spent on it and what it is buying.
- 2) Do an evaluation of similar Early Intervention programs that are implemented by different counties and look at three different groupings of the similar Early Intervention programs trying to determine the outcomes and the impact.
- 3) Final recommendations about what the gaps are, and the next steps they think should be taken.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Vega asked if there were any proposals submitted for the Prevention and Early Intervention. Ms. Hood answered that there were none.

Commissioner Poat asked by what standards the bids were submitted. Ms. Hood again stated that there were no bids. Commissioner Poat then asked for clarification regarding the contracts stating his assumption that this is an attempt to reach out to the University of California, Los Angeles, to make a contract agreement for the simple reason that there is a strict deadline of June 30, 2012. Ms. Hood affirmed his statement.

Commissioner Pating asked if the money would revert if it isn't spent. Ms. Hood answered yes it would if not spent by the deadline.

Commissioner Wooton asked how the California Mental Health Directors Association felt about this. Are the counties up for more program evaluation? Has CMHDA considered the burden to the counties? Aaron Carruthers, Chief Deputy Executive Director, MHSOAC, answered that CMHDA has been apprised of the MHSOAC's efforts.

Commissioner Vega asked if there was a statement from CMHDA and other advocacy groups on the specifics. Mr. Carruthers answered that no statements had been received.

Public Comment

No public comments regarding Early Intervention recommendations were made.

Motion: *Upon motion by Commissioner Poat, seconded by Vice-Chair Van Horn, the Commission voted unanimously to authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute an interagency agreement/contract not to exceed \$300,000 with a California State University, or University of California, or other entity for evaluation of Early Intervention programs.*

4. Consider Recommendation to Authorize Executive Director to Enter into Interagency Agreement/Contracts for Evaluation of Reducing Disparities in Access

Carol Hood presented on the topic of Reducing Disparities in Access. She reiterated her previous statement about looking to contract with someone who meets the qualifications in the RFP and who can provide the specified deliverables. She stated that there is intent to measure the impact of the MHSA as well as state and local policies and practices in access to, quality of and outcomes of the public mental health systems by age, gender, race, ethnicity, and primary language. Additional analyses may be provided if data is available.

The Executive Director will be charged to ensure that any contractor hired would make certain that the deliverables specified in the RFP would be provided.

An overview of the desired deliverables was provided as follows:

- 1) In Depth Data Analysis of Trends in Priority Indicator(s) for Systems of Care Including CSS.
- 2) Analysis of Client and Family Member Perspectives Regarding Impact of MHSA on Disparities.
- 3) Final Recommendations for Future Evaluation Activities for Quality Improvement Activities at the State and/or Local Level.

The proposed interagency agreement/contract must be executed by June, 30, 2012 in order to encumber available funding in the current FY2011-12.

Commissioner Questions

Commissioner Vega asked if quality as well as access would be evaluated. Vice-Chair Van Horn answered that there is limited data available on the quality at this point. He pointed out, however, that one of the deliverables is an analysis of the perspectives of client and family members regarding the impact of disparities. He added that these issues have already been debated within the Evaluation Committee and reminded Commissioner Vega that the point of the meeting was to move to interagency agreements because there was no response to the RFP. Ms Hood added that the principal focus is access, but there are questions that cover quality as well.

Commissioner Vega also asked if the MHSOAC was intending to reach out only to UCLA or if others would be reached out to as well. Mr. Carruthers answered that outreach will be focused on the most relative entities. Vice Chair Van Horn clarified for Commissioner Vega that the motion is not an authorization to reach out only to UCLA. The motion is to give Executive Director Gauger authorization to reach out to any relevant entity that can meet the criteria outlined in the RFP.

Chair Poaster asked for clarification regarding what exactly "other entity" means. Mr. Carruthers answered that the preference governmentally at a state level is to enter into an interagency agreement with a University of California or California State University. If they are not interested, or if a proposal that does not meet the specified criteria is put forth, then the authority to reach out to another entity will be required. This authority is what is being requested.

Commissioner Poat commented that he found it interesting that there was no response to the RFP. He asked if there was a particularly egregious contract provision and why there was no response. Ms Hood answered that a quality improvement process is currently being conducted in order to determine why potential bidders did not bid. So far, the primary strategy is to expand the outreach process in order to ensure that the information is provided to potential bidders in a timely manner.

Commissioner Poat asked how long the RFP allowed potential bidders to submit a bid. Ms. Hood answered that the RFP allowed for a 45 day window, but only a week to submit a required Letter of Intent. Chair Poaster echoed Commissioner Poat's comments. Commissioner Poat then asked if the Executive Director would be willing to include a small "post mortem" report regarding this issue in the next meeting, or the one after. Commissioner Vega agreed with Commissioner Poat's comments.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Motion: *Upon motion by Commissioner Brown, seconded by Vice-Chair Van Horn, the Commission voted unanimously to authorize the Executive Director to negotiate and execute an interagency agreement/contract not to exceed \$400,000 with a California State University, or University of California, or other entity for the Reducing Disparities in Access evaluation.*

5. Consider Recommendation to Approve Amendment to Interagency Agreement with California State University Sacramento to Provide Additional Statewide Data Quality Improvement

Carol Hood stated that the Commission is requested to authorize the Executive Director to execute the following amendment to:

- 1) The Interagency Agreement with University Enterprises, Inc. on behalf of California State University (CSUS) for \$296,500 by June 30, 2012.

Ms. Hood gave a brief background on the CSUS proposal stating that in November, 2011, the Commission approved three priorities for use of \$875,000 in evaluation funds for FY2011-12 as recommended by the Evaluation Committee. One of the priorities was to expand the existing Interagency Agreement with California State University, Sacramento, for continued efforts to increase data quality. An additional expanded evaluation effort to use available administrative funds to build on the current UCLA contract was also made.

The expansion to the current Interagency Agreement with CSUS proposes to strengthen the use of the Data Collection and Reporting (DCR) system resulting in more accurate and reliable data. The statewide support will assist counties in developing standardized reports in order to effectively use the information.

Counties will enter client information and outcomes on Full Service Partnerships (FSP) into the DCR system. Ms. Hood emphasized that overall client outcomes must be accurately reported in order to ensure valid evaluations.

The proposed amendment with CSUS will do the following:

- 1) Adds an additional year to the term.
- 2) Adds \$296,500 for the addition deliverables.
- 3) Provides for the following deliverables:
 - Statewide data quality for improving the DCR data.
 - Regional trainings on how to analyze FSP assessment measures.
 - Additional county and statewide data quality reports which capture new timeframes.

Ms. Hood then went over the proposed motion.

Commissioner Questions

There were no Commissioner questions.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Motion: *Upon motion by Vice-Chair Van Horn, seconded by Commissioner Poat, the Commission voted unanimously to authorize the Executive Director to execute the amendment to the Interagency Agreement with CSUS for \$296,500 by June 30, 2012.*

6. Consider Recommendations to Approve Amendment to UCLA Contract to Provide Additional Reports on Statewide and Local Priority Indicators and Knowledge Transfer and Training to Staff

Carol Hood stated that the Commission is requested to authorize the Executive Director to execute the following amendment to:

- 1) The contract with the Regents of the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) for \$242,000 by June 30, 2012.

Ms Hood gave a brief background on the UCLA proposal stating that the contract amendment with the Regents of UCLA expands the first statewide reporting of priority indicators and transfers that analysis and reporting knowledge to state staff. The proposed administrative funding is available from the current FY and must be encumbered by June 30, 2012.

This amendment uses \$242,000 in available administrative funds to build on the current UCLA contract. These additional funds will be used to build on the current contract with UCLA to develop standardized templates for reporting priority indicators and to document the procedure for compiling the data to produce standardized reports using the most current year of available data.

The proposed amendment with UCLA will do the following:

- 1) Adds additional year to the term of the contract.
- 2) Adds \$242,000 for additional deliverables for reports that include available data from the most current year.
- 3) Provides two deliverables:
 - Written reports on Prioritized Indicators statewide and at the county level by September 30, 2013, and by March 31, 2014.
 - Provides knowledge transfer and training to state staff.

Ms Hood then went over the proposed motion.

Commissioner Questions

There were no Commissioner questions.

Public Comment

There was no public comment.

Motion: *Upon motion by Vice-Chair Van Horn, seconded by Commissioner Poat, the Commission Authorized the Executive Director to execute the UCLA contract amendment for \$242,000 by June 30, 2012.*

7. Adjourn

Chair Poaster briefly went over the agenda for the next Commission Meeting on May 24, 2012. Commissioner Poat asked how Chair Poaster was planning on following up on some key components that were discussed at the last Commission workshop. Chair Poaster stated that another workshop will happen in the near future similar to the workshop that happened in March.

Chair Poaster then adjourned the meeting at 10:08 AM.