

**X INFORMATION**

**TAB SECTION: 7**

**\_\_\_ ACTION REQUIRED**

**DATE OF MEETING: 05/24/12**

**PREPARED BY: Lyon**

**DATE MATERIAL PREPARED: 05/17/12**

---

**AGENDA ITEM: Presentation on Participatory Research Evaluation Deliverables**

**ENCLOSURES:**

- **Report by UCLA titled “Participatory Research Evaluation Proposals” (without Appendices)**

**OTHER MATERIAL RELATED TO ITEM:** The full report in it’s entirety can be accessed at the following link: [http://www.mhsoac.ca.gov/Evaluations/docs/P3\\_Proposals\\_Final\\_1-10-12\\_FINAL.pdf](http://www.mhsoac.ca.gov/Evaluations/docs/P3_Proposals_Final_1-10-12_FINAL.pdf). The PowerPoint presentation will be available at the meeting.

---

**Issue:**

The Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC) 2012 Work Plan makes it a priority to continue to ensure comprehensive evaluation regarding the effectiveness of services being provided and achievement of outcome measures. In 2011, the MHSOAC entered into a contract with the Regents of the University of California, University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA). One of these evaluation efforts UCLA is delivering utilizes the participatory evaluation process for making decisions regarding prioritized outcomes, resulting in studies that consumers and family members have helped to design and implement. At the May 24<sup>th</sup>, 2012 MHSOAC meeting the Commission will receive a presentation regarding the participatory research deliverable. The enclosed report titled, “Participatory Research Evaluation Proposals” provides an overview of the participatory planning process and resulting activities that formulate the proposed recommendations for the study. Ms. Jane Yoo, Ph.D., MSW, a representative from UCLA will present an overview of the participatory planning process for the evaluations and what is to come next. Below is a brief summary regarding both of the deliverables included in the report that will be part of the presentation.

**Background:**

The MHSOAC has a contract with UCLA to evaluate the impact of the MHSA on client outcomes using participatory research with individuals living with mental illness, their family members and personal caregivers, ensuring participation of traditionally unserved and underserved communities across the life span in all aspects of the research. The collaborative process determines priorities for the deliverable regarding what is to be studied and where, when and how it is to be studied. All participatory partners contribute their expertise to enhance understanding of the research question, design, implementation and interpretation of results.

**Background: (continued)**

The deliverable details that UCLA is charged to carry out are as follows:

- a) Determine the impact of at least one type of service strategy funded through the General System Development (GSD) on at least one client outcome prioritized from the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA)/System of Care statutes at the individual/client level.
- b) Determine the impact of involvement of individuals living with mental illness, their families and personal caregivers in the public mental health system on at least one outcome prioritized from the MHSA/System of Care statutes.

UCLA has completed the first phase of the deliverables which was to use the participatory research method to determine which services to evaluate and how to evaluate them. The GSD services chosen to be evaluated are Crisis Intervention Supports and Safety Plans and Peer Counseling programs and the broader MHSA service chosen was Employment Supports programs. The following seven indicators were chosen to be used in evaluating the selected services:

- 1) Paid and unpaid employment
- 2) Consumer well being
- 3) Recovery, wellness, and resilience orientation
- 4) Consumer/family perception of access to services
- 5) Housing situation
- 6) Continuity of care
- 7) Appropriateness of care

Consumers and family members who participated in the participatory planning process agreed that the evaluation should include a mix of quantitative and qualitative methods. Participants specifically recommended a combination of quantitative surveys and qualitative interviews and/or focus groups as the most effective way to collect data. Clients and family members were directly involved in the development of the survey and interview questions.