DRAFT DRAFT

Mental Health Services
Oversight & Accountability Commission

**Evaluation Committee Meeting**
**Minutes**
**June 27, 2013**
**1:00 PM – 4:00 PM**
**1300 17TH Street, Suite 1000**
**Sacramento, CA 95811**

| Committee Members: | Staff: | Other Attendees: |
|---|---|---|
| David Pating, Chair<br>Linda Dickerson<br>Denise Hunt*<br>Debbie Innes-Gomberg<br>Viviana Criado<br>Davis Ja<br>Saumitra SenGupta*<br>Dave Pilon*<br>Steve Leoni<br>Rusty Selix* | Renay Bradley<br>Ashley Mills<br>Brian Geary<br>Filomena Yeroshek<br>Deborah Lee<br>Dee Lemonds | Todd Gilmer<br>Maria Hernandez<br>Jamie Sepulveda<br>Stacie Hiramoto<br>Noemi Castro<br>Individual from El Dorado County* |

*Participation by phone

Committee members absent: Victor Carrion, Kathleen Derby, Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola, Karen Stockton, Stephanie Welch, Stephanie Oprendek, Margaret Walkover

## Welcome/Introductions

The meeting was called to order and everyone in the room and over the phone introduced him or herself. Brian Geary, Associate Governmental Program Analyst, was introduced to the Committee and gave a brief overview of his experience prior to joining the MHSOAC.

## 1. Review and Approve Minutes from April 18, 2013 Evaluation Committee Meeting

After the Committee took a moment to review the minutes, Davis Ja made the motion to pass the minutes. Minutes approved.

## 2. Presentation and Discussion on Findings About Evaluations of Full Service Partnerships Within a Group of California Counties

Dr. Todd Gilmer of UCSD presented preliminary findings from a study of Full Service Partnerships (FSP) within 23 diverse California Counties using a mix of

quantitative and qualitative methods. Some highlights from these preliminary findings include the following:

- FSPs are effective in reducing days homeless and increasing use of outpatient services
- High fidelity programs are associated with greater improvements in residential outcomes
- Clients with the highest illness severity & pre period utilization see reduced inpatient costs
- Qualitative work is providing a depth of understanding, and is being used to complement, explore, and expand on quantitative findings

Committee members discussed the presentation with Dr. Gilmer and talked about Dr. Gilmer maintaining contact with MHSOAC to keep the Evaluation Committee posted on this work and consider involvement in future MHSOAC evaluation efforts focused on FSPs. The notion of Dr. Gilmer using the MHSOAC and the Evaluation Committee as a resource for dissemination efforts related to this work was also discussed.

**Public Comment**

- Public comment from stakeholder in Sacramento County.

**3. Discussion of Fiscal Year (FY) 2013/14 Planned Evaluation Activity: Evaluation and Tracking System for Clients in Less-intensive Services Than Full Service Partnerships**

- Renay reminded the Committee of the details of the recently adopted Evaluation Master Plan and Implementation Plan that describe two new evaluation activities for FY 2013/14 that are to be carried out via two new contracts this coming fiscal year
- Renay explained the purpose of this discussion item was to solicit feedback from the Committee members for the first new contract of the fiscal year in order to consider incorporating ideas shared by Committee members into the RFP; the RFP is scheduled to be released in the Fall of 2013 so that a contract can be awarded as soon as possible
- The budget for this work effort would be up to $700K
- Filomena explained the conflict of interest contract clause that any Committee Member who was either personally interested in bidding on the RFP or personally knew someone who may be interested in bidding should recuse him or herself; Davis Ja recused himself from this discussion and left the room
- Renay solicited feedback around three main questions:
    - Should we define the services to be included in the study within the RFP, or should we request that proposers provide ideas within their

proposals and make it so that the contractor defines them within the scope of their work after the contract has been awarded?
  - Should we define the target population of the study within the RFP, or should we request that proposers provide ideas within their proposals and have this be defined after the contract has been awarded?
  - Should we explicitly state in the RFP which counties should be included in the study, or have this be determined after the contract has been awarded?

**Public Comment**

- No public comment

Davis Ja entered the room again to rejoin the meeting after the discussion for this item concluded

**4. Participatory Research Report Workgroup Report Out to Committee**

Ashley reported key findings and recommendations made by Workgroup members to the Committee on the final UCLA Participatory Research Report:

- Recommended that peer support, crisis, and employment services be included as design elements in MHSA funded mental health delivery systems
- Recommended Implementation Guidelines to address peer support services as a system design feature in MHSA funded delivery systems and during system "transitions"
- The workgroup also recommended additional research based upon the report findings; some of the key topics recommended were:
  - Usage of funds around peer support
  - Service delivery models and system designs with largest impacts on recovery, wellness, and resilience
  - Best practices in peer support and sharing of best practices
  - Elements within peer support that make it effective

**5. Initial Priority Indicators Workgroup Report Out to Committee**

Renay reported the outcome of the Priority Indicators Workgroup. The workgroup discussed potential ideas for the focus of several upcoming UCLA Phase II contract reports pertaining to priority indicators. The group identified several pieces of information that would be helpful for UCLA to generate via the reports, as well as preferred methods of highlighting trends in priority indicators from initial implementation of the Act in 2005 through current day using currently available data. Based on workgroup feedback and discussion with the UCLA contractors, a decision was made to require two reports within the contract. One

initial report will provide a description of currently available data for both FSP and CSS clients for all years from 2004/05 through current day (i.e., as current as the available data is); this report will analyze the available data for each indicator and provide recommendations for best possible ways to calculate each indicator. This report will be shared with the workgroup and used as a point of discussion pertaining to the second report. The second report will use recommendations made by UCLA in conjunction with the MHSOAC and Workgroup members to calculate all 12 priority indicators for all fiscal years from 2004/05 through current day. Trends over time in all indicators will be presented and discussed.

**6. Evaluation Committee Calendaring re: Current Projects & When/Where Assistance may be Needed**

Renay gave a brief overview of where we are on evaluation projects and compared this to the timeline laid out at the beginning of the calendar year.

- Explained that our agendas are mostly set for the remaining two Committee meetings for the current year based on the timeline activities and charter
- Indicated to the committee the need to staff two new workgroups and add members to a third existing workgroup
- Briefly discussed the prioritization process for establishing FY14/15 evaluation that will be discussed in our October meeting

**General Public Comment**

- Public comment was made by two different stakeholders in Sacramento County

**Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 4:08