

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION (MHSOAC)
Evaluation Committee
MHSOAC Offices
1300 12th Street
January 11, 2013
1:30 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.**

Committee Members Present:

David Pating, MD, Chair
David Pilon*
Debbie Innes-Gomberg, PhD
Rusty Selix*
Denise Hunt
Steve Leoni
Saumatri SenGupta, PhD
Stephanie Welch
Stephanie Oprendeck, PhD*
Davis Ja, PhD*
Kathleen Derby*
Richard Van Horn*
Linda Dickerson, PhD
Beverly Scott
Viviana Criado**
Karen Stockton**

Staff:

Renay Bradley, PhD
Cynthia Burt
Filomena Yeroshek
Jose Oseguera

Other Attendees:

Molly Braziel
Kevin Hoffman
Aaron Carruthers
Sherri Gauger

*Participated via telephone

**Omitted in original minutes, corrected following 02-19-13 meeting

Welcome/Introductions

Commissioner Pating convened the meeting at approximately 1:35 p.m.

- All meeting participants introduced themselves, and stated their membership affiliation.

Review and Approve Prior Meeting Minutes

The November 14, 2012 meeting minutes were approved as written, however, a request was made that comments, (public and by committee members), made during the various discussions be more explicitly captured in the meeting minutes.

Review and Approve Committee Charter

- Each of the charter activities is structured in such a way that the committee can focus on each of the evaluations that are currently being worked on.

- 1 --development of an evaluation master plan, we need to think about how to implement and prioritize activities
- 2 --helping with performance indicators extending from UCLA contract and how to strengthen the current contract and how the OAC can do its own monitoring
- 3--provide ongoing support with effort
- 4--continue to strength reporting systems
- 5--participate in work group convened by service committee to assist with integrated plan.
- 6--actionable e items from evaluation efforts and bring reports to other committees. How to create actions plans?
- 7--accountability through evaluative efforts. Alignment with our charge. Paper developed November 2010 (caution about using CSI data, not updated and performance indicators, looking at "buckets" of activities).

Discussion on the elements of the Charter:

Discussion of the charter elicited four general themes; the nature of the evaluative data available, the need for adding integration for committee activities, (using evaluation outcomes competency in integration), the need for sharing evaluation outcomes with other entities and within the MHSOAC committees, and along those same lines, determining the nature of information dissemination from the evaluations.

The committee was concerned that currently the counties are dealing with integration (of services and administrative activities) and that there appears to be a disconnect with what is happening in the counties and what the Commission is planning in terms of integration. The committee wants to ensure that the other entities (state, federal and local levels), that are doing evaluations on same or similar subjects be included in the assessments, as part of not only integration, but also with regard to quality.

Discussion followed regarding difference between quality improvement and quality assurance/compliance being different. Using the Logic Model: that after evaluation, what is done with the information is an opportunity to use quality improvement. Ultimately, it was agreed that David and Renay would work on development of an integration activity for the Charter.

Sharing information was another important discussion with regard to the committee's charter. The group felt that it needed to make sure that the work/outcomes was disseminated to the other committee and a discussion will follow in future meetings regarding what this committee intends, a clearing house? data presentation? It was suggested to make dissemination of information part of the deliverables of every new contract.

Organizing and improving the data collection has been a priority for this committee, as well as the contracts and there are some activities coming up which will help with this and secondarily with the nature of deliverables produced. Discussion of status of projects to strengthen data base to follow.

Discussion of current evaluation projects and areas for Evaluation Committee member involvement.

Master Plan

Renay updated the committee on the master plan. Joan is making revisions and will present to the Commissioners in the January meeting. This will be the first read and the second read will be the 28 of March. A prioritization process is recommended, but the committee's role is to provide advice as to what needs to be prioritized. What the MHSOAC should be working on over the next 3-5 years. The Committee should provide feedback, using the Master Plan as the framework about what should be considered, implemented.

Chair asked Renay to report back to the Committee as to the Commission's reaction to the Master Plan.

Data Quality and Correction Plan

Overlaps with strengthen data collection system. This will continue until 2014. Identify issues that the counties have provided feedback on and look at resolutions/strategies to improve DCR/CSI. DHCS has agreed to receive support so that we can send a contractor over to them to help strengthen system. (MHSOAC is data user and DHCS is owner.)

Chair aside what are we look at over the next 3-6 months that you want the committee to help with. Help with resources, putting people in touch with contractors at the county levels about what needs to be fixed. Comment that one contractor was very helpful providing technical assistance and being a liaison with the OAC and DHCS. Report was issued—Data Quality Report was good on the DCR elements by county.

What are the specific questions the committee needs to ask? Groups will be developed to look or provide feedback on what to do with the data.

ED advises that having people assist Renay does not require the Bagley Keane since they won't be in formal subgroup or committees.

FSP Costs/Cost Offset

Report is completed. Should be ready to report out to Committee at next meeting. Should we send it off to the Services Committee? What to do with the data, since it is really an important study. Counties are still waiting for county level data so counties can see how effective their county is. What are lesson learned?

Trends and Priority Indicators

Will develop baseline for all consumers for FY 04-05 and 05-06. FY 11-12 will be the last year of the report. UCLA is to help the MHSOAC collect this data for themselves after that. April and September, the reports will be back we

should think about how this will contribute to the performance monitoring system. This is the performance monitoring system. Indicators will change with health care reform. How indicators might change should inform how we use the data to one degree or another. Question as to how do we use the information? Have we achieved our goals and if not, what do we need to do to get there?

Impact of Services in Client Outcomes

Participatory research report. Might be one we consider sharing with other committees. Report has been received. Goes to Commission in March.

Reducing Disparities in Access to Care

Quantitative and qualitative piece regarding planning, data sets has been submitted. Staff is now preparing feedback to UCD.

Question as to if the analytic plan will go to the committee or be handled internally. When is appropriate time to request feedback from Committee? Need to develop process whereby committee can do this. Comment from participant that there did not feel like enough time was provided for the participatory partners, felt rushed and did not have the opportunity to fully participate.

PEI Contract

In process of defining cluster of early intervention programs. Three different clusters that are being looked at. This is at developmental stage. In March the final plan will be provided.

Chair recommends that twice a year we take an hour to project calendaring. Status and opportunity for members to participate. July will be next time.

Evaluate Quality of County Innovation Evaluations

RFP being written for this Project. March 28 2013 is anticipated award date. Money must be encumbered before June. Asking respondents to propose how they will carry out inventory of the evaluations.

Evaluate the Impact of the Community Planning Process

Award has been made, Should be executed by February 5 if no protest occurs. Work with client stakeholders on developing a plan for their combined parts/assignments.

Resource Development Associates won the bid for the Evaluation
Peers Envisioning and Engaging in Recovery Services won the bid for the client stakeholder contract

Meeting schedule/location for 2013

Schedule set for year's meetings. Discussion of if there should be a conference call during the intervening months to the meeting. Using call for projects and meetings for discussion? No resolution/decision.

General Committee Comments

Update on stigma reduction, student mental health, and status of RAND project, what has been posted and first deliverables from the CalMHSA-RAND contract. Links will be shared.

CiMH is developing a business plan. Evaluation part of the plan circulated and reviewed at next meeting. 7 main components are the primary issues that DHCS and stakeholders need to address.

Chair asked if there were any other things that should be added or changed for the committee. Agreed that more time was needed, (4 hours?), signs were needed for members.

General Public Comment

No public comments.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:30* p.m.