



**Evaluation Committee
Minutes
CIMH Sequoia Conference Room
2125 19th Street, Second Floor
Sacramento, CA 95811
February 19, 2013
12:30 PM – 3:30 PM**

Committee Members:

Staff:

Other Attendees:

David Pating, Chair Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola Rusty Selix* Debbie Innes Gomberg* Saumitra Sen Gupta* Kathleen Derby* Linda Dickerson Steve Leoni Karen Stockton Davis Ja Denise Hunt Stephanie Oprendeck Viviana Criado	Filomena Yeroshek Kevin Hoffman Renay Bradley Cynthia Burt Deborah Lee	
--	--	--

*Participation by phone

Committee members absent: Victor Carrion, David Pilon, Stephanie Welch

Meeting called to order at 12:35PM

Welcome/General Introductions

Chair Pating welcomed everyone in attendance and introductions were made to re-acquaint new and returning members with each other.

Tab 1 Adoption of the January 11, 2013 Meeting Minutes

The minutes were unanimously approved with two corrections. The minutes were changed to reflect that Viviana Criado and Karen Stockton were present at the January meeting.

Tab 2 Charter Activities Timeline

The timeline was presented to provide an understanding of when various evaluation activities planned for this year (per activities outlined in the 2013 Evaluation Committee Charter) would be anticipated.

- Some Committee Members noted that the timeline was not very specific. MHSOAC staff reminded them that it is not always possible to identify a concrete due date for activities related to current evaluation contracts since many are “in process” or unknown at this time. The timeline will continue to be updated as more details from various activities become known.
- It has sometimes been difficult for Committee Members to give input on current evaluation contracts. Is there a role for the committee in these efforts? Yes; Committee Members will be called upon as needed based on their expressed interests, skills, and areas of expertise.
- The current goal for this Committee is to turn it into a working committee as much as possible. We will do this by establishing workgroups. We will discuss the process of workgroup creation later during this meeting.

Tab 3 Open Discussion Committee Members: Ideas for shaping an integrated evaluative approach with other state and county entities

Chair Pating asks the committee to begin the open discussion on the state of evaluations; what is it you are seeing or need to see in terms of us developing a larger infrastructure? We want to evaluate the Act (MHSA) but we want to ensure that monies blend. We may need something that evolves into a system of care approach. What are your thoughts?

- Where are we with interaction with DHCS? There is some feeling that we area still dealing with silos in state government. Waiting for DHCS to develop a better statewide data system could take time.
- Evaluation takes a very different turn when you are trying to look at the whole health care reform issue.
- We are supposed to be doing evaluation for California community mental health systems, how can OAC be leader in all of California?
- OAC will develop a draft integrated plan and move it through its committees starting this month. The information we collect for evaluations is likely to change in the next couple of years due to integration. Think about creating overall template for mental health and health systems that includes what we have already developed; a team care approach. There should be a push to use the integrated plan and this Committee to inform.
- In the quarterly regional data work groups that CalMHSA funds, we see that many counties are doing some level of evaluation with PEI, some with FSP. We need to think of our mental health programs more as a continuum not as silos. That is what the integrated plan needs to be. A

combination of what is integrated with MHSA and what is integrated with Healthcare reform.

- What are the counties doing? Any thoughts on the state of counties? Counties are doing what they can. Stanislaus is getting ready to evaluate an Innovation project; it is tied to their contract with the program providers. If you don't start with an evaluation plan at beginning of a project, it is abysmal to try to do it after.
- As we look at the different entities, we should also be noting where their evaluation efforts are and if they are linked, in some way, with QI.
- We also need to know how much money is being tied to evaluation of projects. It has been quoted that 10-15% of an entity's budget should be used on evaluation. How much is currently being spent by the counties?
- For all of these efforts to be meaningful, they have to be grounded in service to the person they are intended to serve. We can spend a billion dollars and have it be too little too late. MHSA is just a drop in the bucket with that is happening in California now with health care reform. We are grappling with how to integrate services since none of these services are happening in isolation of each other. Anything we do needs to be grounded in quality improvement and it should be mandatory that the data is meaningful to clients. What are the minimal meaningful data elements that we collect that tell us how we are doing?
- The train has left the station; the feds have already laid this out. We have no guarantees that we will have carved out mental health specialty funds. I get concerned about what is there; we think we are a big fish in our MH puddle, but when we get out into primary care, we will lose if we can't manage this MH care.
- This needs to be set out in terms of what matters to whom. There is a lot of effort to evaluate programs, I am not sure that there is one program that has used evaluation result to improve patient care. To what extent does this matter to the ultimate user? Once again I think it would be very helpful to think about what we want to do with evaluations.
- We should sponsor an evaluation summit to convene all the groups and what they are doing.
- Second/support to the comment about an evaluation summit. As a way to kick start this process, there could be white papers where people give formal presentations of what they are doing. Leading to a summit, we could do a quick survey to gather information about level of interest, what are counties doing, what are the gaps?

- Before anything can happen, a meeting has to take place where all the players can get together and agree on roles and responsibilities. Who is going to work with whom and on what? We are all working very independently. There is a certain size of a meeting that would be ideal for this type of discussion...not too large...something where people can actually make decisions.
- Do we need to find out if we can convene such a meeting and do we have the capacity to start inviting people to this Committee so that we can have some of the knowledge as a working group? Is something like this in the Master Plan?
- The Master Plan says that we should be kept abreast on all that is going on. MHSOAC staff currently attend and provide OAC representation at a variety of evaluation-related meetings and workgroups at the state level (e.g., EPSDT, CiMH Business Plan for DHCS, DHCS IT department, etc.).
- What is becoming clear from our discussion today is a potential agenda for an evaluation-related conference; one that would pull together key players and help us work more collaboratively to achieve some of the goals set forth in the Evaluation Master Plan.

Tab 4 Update on MHSOAC Evaluation Projects

Community Program Planning Evaluation (CPP):

We have awarded two contracts; Resource Development Associates (RDA) who is out of Oakland. This contract is married to the Client Stakeholder contract, which was awarded to Peers Envisioning and Engaging in Recovery Services (PEERS). The point of the RDA contract is to use participatory research to evaluate the CPP. The deliverables are set up so that the two contractors are helping one another.

Full Service Partnership Cost/Cost Offset:

This represents a completed project. The evaluation looked at outcomes, costs, and cost offsets.

What kind of process do we want now to move forward with reports like this that are finalized?

- We want this information to be part of quality improvement process and want lessons learned, but we need better condensation of lessons. We need to decide who the audience is and whether there are further questions we should move up in priority.

- Dr. Bradley and Chair Pating will further discuss a process for considering next steps with all final evaluation reports.

Tab 5 Develop System/Process: How to and what evaluation reports to report out to other MHSOAC committees:

Work groups will be established for some evaluation final reports so that we can pull together and the most pertinent findings from those reports and also consider what and who to disseminate that knowledge to. Staff will set up an agenda for and will establish a series of workgroups for recent final reports. The first work group will be for the FSP cost/cost offset report and then the next one will be for the participatory evaluation.

Committee Meeting Schedule/location for 2013

All future Evaluation Committee meetings will be held at the MHSOAC offices. Some people are not registered for travel. Please make sure to do so if you haven't already.

Date of next meeting April 18th.

Some of our meetings are on the same day as the Planning Council meetings. We realize that this is an issue and are considering what to do about it. It may not be possible to change dates for meetings this year, but we have created a calendar so that this hopefully does not happen again in future years.

Any comments on this meeting, things your likes, need to change?

General Public Comment

None

The meeting was adjourned by Chair Pating at 3:42 PM.