Second Read and Adoption of the Evaluation Master Plan and Adoption of the Implementation Plan for the Master Plan

Commission Meeting
March 28, 2013

Issue

- The MHSOAC is seeking a plan for prioritizing possibilities into a 3-5 year course of action for evaluation investments and activities
- Aims for Today:
  - Consider "Second Read" of *Evaluation Master Plan* and vote regarding adoption
  - Consider *Evaluation Implementation Plan* and vote regarding adoption

Background

- There is a statutory role for MHSOAC to evaluate California's public community-based mental health system
  - [W&I Code 5845(a) and 5845(d)(12)]
- To date, the MHSOAC has not had a comprehensive plan or framework to guide its evaluation efforts
- Dr. Joan Meisel was hired by the MHSOAC to draft an Evaluation Master Plan through a collaborative effort with state departments, counties, and stakeholders

Background (cont.)

- "First Read" of Evaluation Master Plan at January 24, 2013 Commission Meeting
  - Commissioner suggestions have since been incorporated into the Plan
  - Other State entities have also been offered the opportunity to provide feedback on the Plan

Overview of the Evaluation Master Plan

- Evaluation Model / Paradigm (see p. 7)
- Evaluation Activities (see p. 12-13)
- Priority Setting (see p. 38)

Revisions to the Evaluation Master Plan—Commissioner Requests

- Addition of "Family Members" and "Family Connectedness" to outcomes described within the Evaluation Model / Paradigm
- Addition of "peer-led" to study #6 (focused on peer-led and consumer run services)

Revisions to the Evaluation Master Plan—Requests from Others

- **DHCS:**
  - Role in performance monitoring after completion of UCLA contract
  - Partnering to discuss and support immediate need to devote sufficient resources to existing data systems
- **Planning Council:**
  - Ensure that all forthcoming documents are understandable by the diverse array of MHSA stakeholders
- **CMHDA:**
  - Agree with need for continuous quality improvement efforts and improvements in data reporting systems
  - Request more collaboration with counties on evaluation designs

Proposed Motion

- Adopt the MHSOAC Evaluation Master Plan

Overview of the Evaluation Implementation Plan

- Summarizes evaluation priorities for FY 2013/14 – 2017/18 given two alternatives:
  1) MHSOAC is provided with additional resources for evaluation
  2) MHSOAC evaluation efforts continue on via our current level of resources

Alternative 1. Summary of Activities with Additional Resources

FY	Number of Activities In Progress	Total Funds Needed for All Activities	Additional Funds Needed for All Activities	Number of Additional RS Needed	Number of Additional RPS Needed
2013/14	16	$1,300,000	$300,000	2 RS	3 RPS
2014/15	16	$2,150,000	$1,150,000	2 RS	3 RPS
2015/16	16	$2,700,000	$1,700000	2 RS	3 RPS
2016/17	17	$2,350,000	$1,350,000	2 RS	3 RPS
2017/18	12 + 4 TBD	$2,350,000	$1,350,000	2 RS	3 RPS
Total:	**77 + 4 TBD**	**$10,850,000**	**$5,850,000**	**2 RS**	**3 RPS**

Benefits of Alternative 1

- More staff now will allow us to build an internal evaluation unit that could complement work done by contractors
- More staff will ensure that we can provide ongoing performance monitoring
- We will continue to provide support of the statewide data collection and reporting systems
- Evaluation activities and priorities will be dictated by needs, rather than available resources
- Expectations for quality of work done by staff and contractors would not need to be negotiated based on availability of resources

Alternative 2. Summary of Activities with Current Resources

FY	Number of Activities In Progress	Total Funds Available for All Activities
2013/14	11	$1,000,000
2014/15	8	$1,000,000
2015/16	6	$1,000,000
2016/17	7	$1,000,000
2017/18	7	$1,000,000
Total:	**39**	**$5,000,000**

Caveats of Alternative 2

- We will not contribute funds to strengthening statewide data collection systems
- All major activities will be contracted out; no internal research will take place
- Projects will be dictated by available funds rather than the work that needs to be done
- In some cases, estimated costs to complete projects were lowered, which presents the risks of needing to lower expectations, or not being able to attract quality contractors
- Work that is proposed to be done on an ongoing basis may not be feasible
- Although some activities would develop processes to enable ongoing evaluation and tracking, there would not be enough staff to use these systems
- Most medium-priority studies would not be completed
- Staff needed to monitor or carry out the proposed activities will not be available
- The Director of Research and Evaluation will spend the bulk of her time managing contracts rather than providing true leadership and vision for the MHSOAC's evaluation efforts

Proposed Motion

- Adopt the MHSOAC Evaluation Implementation Plan for Fiscal Years 2013/14 – 2017/18