



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

| <b>Committee Members:</b>   | <b>Staff:</b>  | <b>Other Attendees:</b>  |
|---|--|--|
| David Pating, Chair<br>Victor Carrion, Vice Chair*<br>Debbie Innes-Gomberg*<br>Viviana Criado<br>Davis Ja<br>Dave Pilon*<br>Rusty Selix<br>Saumitra SenGupta*<br>Stephanie Welch*<br>Steve Leoni<br>Lynn Thull*<br>Joshua Morgan* | Ashley Mills<br>Brian Geary<br>Sheridan Merritt<br>Keith Erselius<br>Celeste Doerr<br>Filomena Yeroshek<br>Kevin Hoffman<br>Deborah Lee* | Stacie Hiramoto<br>Jim Gilmer<br>David Czarnecki<br>Laura Leonelli<br>Sally Zinman<br>Cyndi Eppler<br>Doris Estremera<br>Carol Hood*<br>Diane Prentiss*<br>Michele Violett*<br>Dana Stein*<br>Raja Mitry*<br>Stakeholder from San Bernadino County |

\*Participation by phone

Committee members absent: Linda Dickerson, Stephanie Oprendeck, Margaret Walkover, Karen Stockton, Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola

**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 February 4, 2014 Evaluation Committee Meeting**

A quorum was not established when the meeting was initially called to order. Approval of the minutes was postponed until later in the meeting when enough Committee members were present to form a quorum. Once the quorum was established, the Evaluation Committee (Committee) took a moment to review the

minutes, Davis Ja made the motion to pass the minutes; Vivianna Criado seconded the motion. Steve Leoni abstained from the vote. Minutes approved.

## **2. Overview of the MHSOAC Evaluation Master Plan**

Brian Geary presented a set of slides to provide a quick overview of the MHSOAC Evaluation Master Plan (MP). After the presentation, there was a question about whether the MHSOAC would be looking at Community Based Practices (CBP) within the scope of our upcoming evaluations; staff referred the member of the public to review the MP, which describes a specific study covering, in part, CBP; the member was also told to direct any queries about specific studies to staff.

## **3. Information: Report Out of February 20, 2014 Data Strengthening Workgroup; Use of Fiscal Year 2014/15 Funds for Continued Data Strengthening**

Staff member Keith Erselius gave an overview of the discussion and recommendations from the Data Strengthening Workgroup Meeting on February 20, 2014. The main objective of that meeting was to determine how to use the Fiscal Year 2014/15 funds of \$500,000 that have been earmarked for strengthening of statewide data systems. The workgroup discussed two possible ways to use the funds: 1) continue to strengthen the current data systems (i.e., the DCR and CSI), or 2) invest in moving toward adoption of a new statewide data collection system; pros and cons were discussed regarding both options:

1. Continue to invest in existing systems:
  - The workgroup discussed the current MHSOAC contracts to improve the data quality and function of current statewide data collection and reporting systems
  - The workgroup was reluctant to further invest heavily in the current data systems given the dilapidated state they are in
  - The workgroup recognized the need for a minimal level of investment to maintain those existing systems while alternative options are considered (as the State is still reliant upon these system to obtain data for evaluation purposes, and the data collected during recent years will eventually be rolled up into the new system)
2. Invest money into a new statewide data system:
  - The workgroup discussed the MHSOAC evaluation contract with University of California, San Diego to pilot a potential new statewide CSS system called HOMS; this contract will build the foundation for an eventual new statewide system (i.e., one of its objectives is to generate needs/preferences for data to include in a new statewide system and preferable data collection methods); until this

foundational work is done, we may not be ready to invest any further in a new system

The workgroup's recommendation after the discussion was to invest the money in working toward a new statewide data system by hiring a contractor to map out the steps the State needs to take in order to get us from where we are now to finally adopting a new statewide data collection and reporting system that would replace the current systems. Part of the contract may include getting all necessary partners/entities on the same page regarding roles (e.g., MHSOAC, DHCS), as well as implementation of some of the steps (e.g., development of a feasibility study report and advanced planning document). Next steps included sharing this recommendation with DHCS to ensure their collaboration in the project.

- Public comment by Stacie Hiramoto of REHMDCO

#### **4. Presentation on Participatory Research Methods and How They Have Been Utilized by the MHSOAC**

MHSOAC staff members Ashley Mills and Keith Erselius presented on participatory research and how it has been used by the Commission to date. The presentation covered two main topics: 1) research paradigms and participatory research methods and 2) current MHSOAC use of research methods in general, with specific deliverables, and some examples.

At the end of the presentation, the guest speakers, Cyndi Eppler and Sally Zinman, of the Client Stakeholder Project were introduced to give their first-hand experience working on a participatory research project with the MHSOAC.

#### **5. Presentation by Members of the Client Stakeholder Project (CSP) on Their Experience Participating in the MHSOAC Community Program Planning Process Evaluation**

Cyndi Eppler, Program Manager, CSP, along with Sally Zinman, Program Director, CSP presented the background of the project, experiences, and lessons learned by CSP using those with lived experience in the MHSOAC sponsored statewide evaluation of the CPP Process.

- The presentation began with an overview of the working collaborative relationships within this participatory research project which included CSP (those with lived experience), the evaluators Research Development Associates (RDA), MHSOAC, and the counties
- CSP was involved throughout the various stages of the research from design to reporting and data interpretation

- The design of the project included stakeholder participation from the beginning, including four regional partners who were stakeholders themselves; the four regions were Los Angeles/Southern California, Sacramento/Central Valley, San Francisco/Bay Area and Northern California
- Some of the challenges CSP faced throughout the project:
  - Lack of transparency across the two contractors (RDA and CSP) as to the scope and timelines of their respective deliverables; this encouraged consistent communication across all the partners in the project
  - Travel across the mountainous regions during the winter months required planning and flexibility; front loading interviews early in the data collection process in case rescheduling was required due to inclement weather
  - Lack of time allotted (three months) to data collection hindered the ability to reach as many people in the un-served/underserved communities as CSP would have liked
  - Lack of human resources to blanket entire geography of the state
- Recommendations in work plan design for future participatory studies:
  - Increase the time frame and resources to better allow outreach to unserved/underserved populations
  - Increase the level to which the project is participatory; constant stakeholder involvement in the design and execution of the evaluation throughout the project beyond the input from the summit

At the conclusion of the presentation by CSP, the floor was opened to questions. Committee members would like to hear from RDA on their perspective of participatory research as well as to present on their list of recommended best practices for the Community Program Planning process. It was recommended that RDA present at a future Evaluation Committee Meeting.

## **6. Discussion: Development of Methods for Involving Those with Lived Experience with or without Evaluation Experience in MHSOAC Evaluations**

At the conclusion of the presentation by CSP, the Evaluation Committee was directed to revisit the final slides in the handout defining lived experience. Before the discussion began, staff reminded the Committee that a large majority of staff members and Committee Members themselves have identified as having lived experience with mental illness.

The group focused the discussion first on how best to involve those with lived experience in MHSOAC Evaluations. Some recommendations based on the discussion:

## Evaluation Committee

April 1, 2014

- Recognize the scope and accomplishments of the CSP and the CPP Evaluation Process
- Use the documentation of this process as a learning tool for future participatory evaluation projects
- Understand both the politics and methods of inclusion of stakeholders
- Continue to utilize the network that has been developed as part of CPP Evaluation for future stakeholder involvement in evaluations
- Utilize other existing frameworks for reaching underrepresented groups (e.g., CRDP)
- Staff to look into bringing these points forward to the CLCC & CFLC to develop methods of engaging stakeholders and using the networks available to those Committees

### Public comments by:

Jim Gilmer of REHMDCO

Raja Mitry

Michele Violett of Nevada County

The group then shifted the focus of the conversation to how best to involve those with lived experience in the Evaluation Committee. Commissioner Carrion shared the importance of defining what lived experience is for the purpose of our committee and opened up the discussion asking Committee Members to help define lived experience within the context of the Evaluation Committee. The group recognized the breadth and importance of the diversity of lived experience:

- Understand the role that micro aggressions (e.g., race, poverty) play within lived experience
- Ensure that parents – in addition to caregivers – are included
- Community members in the older adult community should be included given their role as surrogate caregivers
- Ensure that stakeholders with lived experience from underserved groups are able to advocate for those groups and not just “check the box”
- Understand that researchers may have lived experience and can advocate as such
- Respecting the diversity of lived experience, not lose focus of the clients, family members, caregivers, and parents of those utilizing the public mental health system

Some of the recommended methods of involving those with lived experience included:

- Utilize the county relationships with local networks of client groups to engage and inform stakeholders

## Evaluation Committee

April 1, 2014

- Look at agenda items and create a process to ensure relevant stakeholders are involved; think of who is not included, on the periphery
- Ensure the minority voice is heard in discussions and policy recommendations
- Staff to engage and link to CFLC and CLCC to help with stakeholder capacity building
- Use Community Forums and other community-based activities to educate the population on the role of the state as a form of engagement; understand where the money comes from and the structure and roles of various groups involved (i.e. State, County, Provider, Evaluator)
- Interpret data through the lens of those with lived experience from the gathering of the data, analysis and interpretation

### Public comments made by:

Jim Gilmer of REHMDCO

Stacie Hiramoto of REHMDCO

Raja Mityr

Michele Violett of Nevada County

Reneé Keys of NAMI Solano County

Cyndi Eppler of CSP

Sally Zinman of CSP

David Czarnecki of NAMI California

Beverly Scott, Stakeholder from San Bernadino County

### **General Public Comment**

No general public comment

### **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 4:03 PM