DRAFT DRAFT

Mental Health Services
Oversight & Accountability Commission

Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes
June 3, 2014
1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
1325 J Street, Suite 1700
MHSAOC Board Room
Sacramento, CA 95814

Committee Members:	Staff:	Other Attendees:
David Pating, Chair Victor Carrion, Vice Chair Debbie Innes-Gomberg Viviana Criado Davis Ja Dave Pilon* Rusty Selix Saumitra SenGupta Steve Leoni Lynn Thull Joshua Morgan* Linda Dickerson Margaret Walkover	Renay Bradley Ashley Mills Brian Geary Sheridan Merritt Keith Erselius Celeste Doerr Carrie Masten Filomena Yeroshek	Adrienne Shilton Ryan Quist Rhenae Keys Dana Stein* Robin Meloche* Stakeholder from San Mateo County

*Participation by phone

Committee members absent: Stephanie Oprendek, Karen Stockton, Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola, Stephanie Welch

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.

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

The Evaluation Committee (Committee) took a moment to review the minutes, Davis Ja made the motion to pass the minutes; Steve Leoni seconded the motion. Minutes approved.

2. Information: Review of MHSOAC Evaluation Master Plan and Update to Committee on All Current Evaluation Activities and Areas Where Support and Guidance is Needed

Renay Bradley presented a quick overview of the Evaluation Master Plan (MP) focusing on the Evaluation Master Plan Model and the annual prioritization process. Renay then went through the Evaluation Performance Dashboard and highlighted key evaluation projects and reports.

There was a request from multiple Committee Members to make the reports from our major evaluations more accessible via the website.

Committee Members expressed an interest in having some record of where we have been, where we are, and where we are going with regards to Evaluation.

3. Discussion: Review the MHSOAC Evaluation Master Plan Prioritization Process and Provide Recommendations to Potentially Improve the Process for the Upcoming Prioritization of Fiscal Year 2015/16 Evaluation Activities

Renay Bradley gave some background information on how the original prioritization process came to be in the Master Plan, how it was used last year to determine the FY 2014/15 priority evaluation activities, and how new activities get added to the original list of potential activities in the MP. The Committee then discussed the criteria identifying current challenges and potential recommended changes:

- Find a way of incorporating impact to the counties both in the usefulness of the study and the impact on the counties of conducting the study
- Multiple Committee Members recommended using the criterion concerning if an evaluation is consistent with the values of the MHSA as an initial screen (yes or no), before rating the study on the other criteria.
- Quality Improvement was considered a key criterion and the Committee wanted to find a way to emphasize this in the prioritization process
    - Potentially weight this criterion more heavily using the scale
    - Add additional sub criterion (which will weight QI without changing the scale):
        - Cost Effectiveness
        - Does this study build a baseline in which to measure future progress?
        - Does it measure reduction in unmet need?
        - Does it measure experience of care?

Some of the challenges with the current criteria:

- Some studies overlapped in scope making it difficult to rate similar studies highly over one another
- Cost criterion currently not useful; ideally, you create the research questions, design the scope of work, and then figure out the cost. We are doing it backwards.

The Committee took some time to discuss how the evaluation dollars were being spent with regards to the priorities within the MP. The group discussed the Implementation Plan and how it indicates spending the additional evaluation funds that were approved by the legislature (starting in FY 13/14) for Evaluation. The Committee discussed if it still made sense to fund studies as the Implementation Plan details.

Committee Members acknowledged that the current amount of funding for MHSOAC Evaluation is not sufficient in order to be effective in achieving the Commission's role of oversight and accountability (e.g., some stand along studies may have a budget of $5m to answer one research question and the Commission's entire annual Evaluation budget is ~$2.5m. used across multiple studies.) Evaluation provides a rationale for why the MHSA is needed and should continue. The Commission should look to create additional funding (e.g., federal funds, California Endowment, and the State Legislature for long-term needs). The Commission should also revisit the Master Plan to ensure that it is a completely comprehensive document in guiding the evaluation of the MHSA.

The Committee agreed to have staff take away the recommendations made at this meeting and incorporate them into a draft of new prioritization criteria. The Committee will then add a meeting in July to review and give feedback to staff on this draft one last time before it is presented to the Commission for potential adoption.

4. Discussion: Consideration of Evaluation Efforts Sponsored by Other Entities and How the MHSOAC Can Use Them for Quality Improvement Purposes

Due to lack of time, this item was tabled; to be added to a future meeting.

5. Discussion: Continued Consideration of How MHSOAC Evaluation Efforts Can Be Used for Quality Improvement Purposes; Follow Up on Previously Discussed Committee Ideas

Due to lack of time, this item was tabled; to be added to a future meeting.

General Public Comment

Ryan Quist, Riverside County
Steve Leoni, Committee Member
Vivianna Criado, Committee Member
Linda Dickerson, Committee Member

Adjournment
Meeting adjourned at 4:00 PM