

MHSA Statewide Participatory Evaluation Final Results

Presentation to the Mental Health Services
Oversight and Accountability Commission

 
March 28, 2013



UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families & Communities



Presenters

Jane Yoo, PhD, MSW  Kristin J. Ward, PhD

Clarus Research

Hurley Mercial  John Mercial, BA

Oak Park Outreach Services

Deliverables

Using participatory research ...

1. Determine impact of at least one type of service/strategy funded with GSD funding category on at least one outcome prioritized from the MHSA/System of Care statutes at the individual/client level
2. 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

3

Participatory Evaluation

For our study

- ∞ 91 participants in statewide regional meetings and phone calls
- ∞ 10 participatory evaluation partners (PEPs)
- ∞ PEPs are persons with lived experiences, consumers, and family members who are closely affiliated with advocacy and service organizations or staff of those organizations
- ∞ PEPs represented all age groups, regions, and various un-served and underserved groups

4

Participatory Evaluation (continued)

PEPs had a role in every aspect of the evaluation process

- ☞ Helped develop survey and interview protocol
- ☞ Received human subjects training
- ☞ Helped recruit study participants
- ☞ Helped conduct qualitative interviews
- ☞ Participated in data analysis activities
- ☞ Helped interpret study findings
- ☞ Reviewed and commented on all versions of the report

5

Study Focus

Selection of services to evaluate

- ☞ Crisis intervention
- ☞ Employment supports
- ☞ Peer support

6

Study Design & Samples

Statewide survey (target of 750)

- ☞ 949 completed surveys
- ☞ Built-in comparison groups

In-depth qualitative interviews (target of 40)

- ☞ 40 completed interviews
- ☞ Special focus populations (homeless, veterans, physical disabilities, LGBTQ, parolees)
- ☞ Ethnic, gender, and age diversity
- ☞ Regional representation

7

Sample Representation

- ☞ All regions of state
- ☞ Urban and rural communities
- ☞ All four MHSA age categories
- ☞ Different genders
- ☞ Traditionally unserved and underserved populations (i.e., physical disabilities, homeless, racial/ethnic groups, and LGBTQ)

8

Study Questions

- ↻ What were the characteristics of individuals who received services?
- ↻ What types of services were received?
- ↻ What were individuals' perceptions of access to services?
- ↻ Was there continuity of care for individuals who received crisis services before and after the crisis?
- ↻ To what extent did services exemplify a recovery/resilience orientation?
- ↻ Was there a change in employment, housing, and recovery/resilience/wellness after receiving services?

9

Measures

Outcome indicators

- ↻ Access to services
- ↻ Appropriateness of care
- ↻ Continuity of care
- ↻ Recovery oriented services
- ↻ Employment
- ↻ Housing situation
- ↻ Recovery/resilience and wellness

10

Findings: Peer Support Services

Indicators	Study Findings
Access to Services	10.0% had difficulty
Appropriateness of Services:	
Fit cultural and life experiences	76.8%
Inviting and dignified physical spaces	78.0%
Desired services	76.7%
Recovery Oriented Services	Significant differences
Employment:	
Employment improvement	No group differences
Services improved employment	52.7%
Housing:	
Housing improvement	No differences
Services improved housing	71.7%
Recovery/Resilience and Wellness:	Significant differences
Recovery/resilience improvement	
Services helped to feel better	81.3%
Services helpful with recovery	76.9%

11

Findings: Employment Services

Indicators	Study Findings
Access to Services	21.1% had difficulty
Appropriateness of Services:	
Fit cultural and life experiences	56.7%
Inviting and dignified physical spaces	72.2%
Desired services	68.3%
Recovery Oriented Services	Significant differences
Employment:	
Employment improvement	No differences
Services improved employment	67.2%
Housing:	
Housing improvement	No differences
Services improved housing	64.3%
Recovery/Resilience and Wellness	Significant differences

12

Findings: Crisis Intervention

Indicators	Study Findings
Access to Services	21.1% had difficulty
Continuity of Care	Significant differences
Recovery Oriented Services	Significant differences
Employment	No differences
Housing	No differences
Recovery/Resilience and Wellness:	
Recovery/resilience improvement	Significant differences
Psychiatric hospitalization	No differences

13

Summary

- ⌘ Importance of overlapping services
- ⌘ High levels of access with room for improvement
- ⌘ Greater continuity of care
- ⌘ Positive perception of services as recovery oriented
- ⌘ Mixed findings on employment and housing
- ⌘ Improvement in recovery/resilience and wellness

14

Implications

☞ For practice

- Win-win for peer support services

☞ For evaluation

- Measurement strategies
- Strengths of participatory evaluation

15

Questions?

Jane Yoo, PhD, MSW
jane@clarusresearch.org

Kristin Ward, PhD
kristin@clarusresearch.org

Todd Franke, PhD
tfranke@ucla.edu

16