



Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes
February 4, 2014
1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
1300 17TH Street, Suite 1000
Sacramento, CA 95811

Committee Members:

Staff:

Other Attendees:

David Pating, Chair*	Renay Bradley	Beatrice Lee*
Victor Carrion, Vice Chair*	Ashley Mills	Adrienne Shilton
Linda Dickerson	Brian Geary	Raja Mitry
Debbie Innes-Gomberg*	Deborah Lee	Mary Ann Bernard
Viviana Criado	Sheridan Merritt	Ryan Quist
Davis Ja	Keith Erselius	Wesley Sheffield
Dave Pilon*	Celeste Doerr	Diane Prentiss*
Rusty Selix	Andrea Jackson	Tracy Hazleton*
Karen Stockton		Representative from Yolo County
Saumitra SenGupta		
Joshua Morgan*		
Stephanie Welch		
Steve Leoni		
Lynn Thull		
Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola*		

*Participation by phone

Committee members absent: 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. Several representatives from stakeholder groups and counties around the state attended the Evaluation Committee meeting again.

1. Review and Approve Minutes from January 14, 2014 Evaluation Committee Meeting

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

2. Overview of the MHSOAC Evaluation Master Plan

Renay Bradley presented a set of slides to provide a quick overview of the MHSOAC Evaluation Master Plan (MP). After the presentation, there was a short discussion that covered a few key topics:

- Committee members expressed an interest in revisiting the criteria for the MP prioritization process to modify or weight specific criteria for future evaluation prioritization exercises; the Committee will cover this as a specific agenda item at a future meeting in 2014 so that the revised process can be used this Fall to prioritize evaluation activities for Fiscal Year (FY) 2015/16.

3. UCLA Report on Use of PEI Funds on PEI Programs (Deliverable 1) – Discussion of Results and Consideration of Dissemination Efforts and Policy Implications

Renay Bradley highlighted the overall objectives of the Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) report being discussed. Renay asked the Committee how best to disseminate the findings of the report (i.e. what information is worthy of sharing, and with whom) and if there were any policy recommendations to be made. Committee members provided feedback on the report regarding next steps:

- MHSOAC should bring together a workgroup(s) to help define best practices (based on target populations) for screening and referrals to treatment outside of PEI services with a goal to inform counties of how to spend funds most effectively on PEI; workgroup members could be made up of county representatives, contractors, state representatives, and health plans:
- MHSOAC needs to establish a systematic approach (definitions of terminology, common measures, etc) and data system to collect PEI data; counties need to know in advance what the State expects of them in terms of data that will be required
- Help the counties understand what MHSOAC evaluation contract deliverables are for early on in the process – get them involved early before data collection begins so that the methods are strengthened, feasible for counties, and provide meaningful end results
- MHSOAC should provide Training and Technical Assistance for PEI Programs and their evaluations where possible
- MHSOAC should group counties together based on use of similar practices to encourage learning from one another and to come to a consensus
- Be careful not to disseminate or publicize the results that pertain to expected cost benefits too much, given that the cost benefit metrics are only expected and not based on costs and outcomes from actual California PEI programs, and also because the PEI programs defined as being evidence based practices only include a small fraction of the full statewide PEI services provided (other PEI services may be cost effective and worthy to evaluate, too)
- The Evaluation Committee needs to be able to connect the dots between MHSOAC evaluations and other studies and understand and explain why the results may differ (i.e. Healthcare Foundations study of increased

hospitalization for EPSDT vs. the PEI cost benefit data in this UCLA report)

Public Comments made by:
Beatrice Lee of REMHDCO
Raja Mitry of CLCC Committee
Mary Ann Bernard of MentalIllnesspolicy.org

4. Presentation of CalMHSA Statewide PEI Projects Status Update

Stephanie Welch of CalMHSA presented a set of slides to provide an update on the status of CalMHSA's statewide PEI projects and was followed by a discussion of the Committee.

- Audrey Burnam of RAND discussed the literature review performed on Stigma and Discrimination (S&D), Suicide Prevention and Student Mental Health and how the CalMHSA strategic plan includes the types of programs that the literature supports as being effective.
- There was a discussion on the challenges of collecting data on disparities for PEI services and the lack of experience implementing Evidence Based Practices within traditionally underserved populations
- There was a discussion about the reach of the S&D statewide campaign and how the efforts are impacting S&D against the most severely mentally ill; look to quality improvement of S&D program messages

5. Development of Recommendations to Make to the Commission Regarding the Current Status of PEI Project Evaluations

Renay Bradley introduced this discussion item by reminding the Committee that, within the MHSOAC 2014 Work Plan, there is an item calling for increased MHSOAC oversight of the CalMHSA statewide PEI programs and evaluations. This item was placed onto the 2014 Evaluation Committee Charter. Renay asked the Committee for recommendations on what should be shared with the Commission with regards to the project/evaluations:

- The discussion focused primarily on the question of what oversight the Commission should be providing at this point and what has been done in the past, rather than provision of specific recommendations regarding the status of the programs and their evaluations. Several ideas were presented regarding how the Commission could possibly provide oversight at this point of these projects, as well as rationale for why such oversight should be provided (or not):
 - The Statewide Evaluation Experts (SEE) team, which was formed by CalMHSA, should inform the Commission; outcomes of SEE Team Meetings should be reported out at the forthcoming Evaluation Committee Meeting

Evaluation Committee
February 4, 2014

- CalMHSA could present to the other Committees within the Commission on the content of the Programs
- CalMHSA to internally determine a recommendation of future funding and projects; recommendation for the Commission to review the proposal at some point in the process for oversight and input
- Commission could take a mediator role between the counties and the legislature to help determine if the legislature would want to step in and provide additional funding to statewide efforts should not enough counties decide to support them

Public Comments made by:
Mary Ann Bernard of Mentalillnesspolicy.org
Ryan Quist of Riverside County

6. Development of Methods for Involving Those with Lived Experience with or without Evaluation Experience in the Evaluation Committee

It was decided to table this discussion due to a lack of time to have a meaningful discussion and to add it as an agenda item at a future meeting.

General Public Comment

- Public comments made by:
- Mary Ann Bernard, mentalillnesspolicy.org
 - Steve Leoni, Committee Member
 - Saumitra SenGupta, Committee Member
 - Dave Pilon, Committee Member
 - Debbie Innes-Gomberg, Committee Member
 - Joshua Morgan, Committee Member
 - Victor Carrion, Committee Vice Chair

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:58 PM