

MINUTES
Cultural and Linguistic Competence Committee
March 30, 2010

1:00 PM to 5:00 PM

CiMH

2125 19th Street, 2nd Floor
Sacramento, CA 95818

Attendance

CLCC Members	CLCC Staff	Other Attendees
Richard Van Horn, Chair	Jose Oseguera	Kathleen Derby
Eduardo Vega, Vice-Chair	Pete Best	Amira Qotb*
Stacie Hiramoto	Filomena YeroShek	Autumn Valerio
Rachel Guerrero	Deborah Lee*	Jim Gilmer
Jo Ann Johnson		
Gwen Wilson*		
Laurel Benhamida*		
Nancy Carter		
Will Rhett-Mariscal*		
Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola		
Gwen Slattery		
Amber Burkan		
Janet King		
Doretha Williams-Flournoy		
<u>Absent</u>		
Kelvin Lee		
Mertice "Gitane" Williams		
Leticia Alejandrez		
C. Rocco Cheng		

* Participated via telephone

Chair Van Horn, called the meeting to order at 1:10 PM.

I. Welcome and Introductions

Chair Van Horn welcomed attendees and asked participants to introduce themselves.

II. CLCC Comments/Discussion

- a) Co-Chair Vega invited everyone to attend the California Mental Health Advocacy Conference at the Wilshire Grand Hotel in Los Angeles, CA on April 15 and 16, 2010.
- b) CLCC Committee Consultant Best stated that at the January 2010 CLCC meeting, members requested that the minutes be recorded in a table format. However, the direction from management at the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC) indicated that a standardized format would be used by the committees to record the minutes. Therefore, the minutes were recorded in a narrative format with action items bolded.

III. Review of January 27, 2010 Minutes

CLCC members requested several modifications to the minutes.

The following changes were requested:

- a) Page 2, Item C, Reword the action item to read “the CLCC will form a workgroup to develop a process for the selection of communities to present at CLCC meetings.” The outcome of this discussion will be presented to the CLCC at the next meeting.
- b) Page 2, Item G, remove “action” label the statement that followed the action was a group discussion, not an “action item.”
- c) Page 2, Item H, reword to read “How can the CLCC improve the stakeholder process and encourage stakeholders to speak? First, this committee needs to develop a process regarding how to invite and encourage stakeholders to our meetings. What committees are assigned follow-up from the stakeholder meeting? Can the CLCC collaborate with that committees?”
- d) When recording the minutes, use general statements: “some members felt, or various members stated,” if the opinion expressed was not a consensus agreement.

IV. Review Updated 2010 CLCC Charter

CLCC member reviewed the 2010 CLCC Charter.

The following is a synopsis of the discussion:

- a) Under Training Number 1, reword to read: “The CLCC will invite specific cultural and ethnic communities to CLCC meetings to discuss their perspective and participation. The CLCC will collect and discuss issues and determine which issues should be presented to the MHSOAC (November 2010 – January 2011).”
- b) Add the following activity as Number 3 under Program Delivery: “In partnership with the CFLC, through feedback and review sessions the CLCC will provide recommendations to build capacity for groups to participate within each county to ensure that community mental health program planning at the local level is inclusive and accountable for stakeholder input and general recommendations regarding the stakeholder process, engagement and the value of racial, ethnic, and cultural communities and other stakeholders for MHSOAC approved communications (November 2010).”
- c) Change item III, Metrics Delivery to Accountability.
- d) Insert the following activity as Number 4 under Accountability, “In partnership with the Evaluation Committee, provide Resource Development Associates with input on cultural and linguistic competence data/resources for inclusion in the Phase I Scope of Work development for the Comprehensive Evaluation (April - May 2010).”
- e) Add the California Youth Empowerment Network (CAYEN) to the list of stakeholders under the Committee composition.

V. Additional Discussion Items:

CLCC members discussed the Services Committee meeting that was held earlier that day and the Research Development Associates, (RDA) presentation. The following is a synopsis of the conversations:

- a) Who oversees RDA? MHSOAC Staff stated that Carol Hood and Monica Grass are leads over that assignment.
- b) Is RDA collecting data from families and client, not just providers?
- c) Is RDA Tracking rates of access to all programs by race and ethnicity?
- d) Since 51% of Prevention and Early Intervention (PEI) funds are earmarked to be spent on children, will RDA track how much money is spent on children and how many of them will be served at home as opposed to outside the home by race and ethnicity?
- e) This is a great time for the CLCC to supply input to RDA.
- f) Does RDA understand what data is available and from what resources?
- g) RDA is conducting a data inventory and is making recommendations for the Comprehensive Evaluation Scope of Work. Providers are not being told how to track data under PEI.

Action: RDA will be asked to provide a presentation to the CLCC at the April 2010 Meeting

VI. PEI Trends Report Update

I. MHSOAC Consulting Psychologist Deborah Lee provided an overview of the PEI Trends Report. The following is a synopsis of her presentation of this topic:

- a) The Trends Report is an analysis of 32 County PEI Plans. Of those 32 plans, 17 were from small counties.
- b) The Report consists of information based on a collection of projects and programs.
- c) On page 12 of the report, the Racial, Ethnic, and Language Groups Chart displays information based on 32 counties and 232 program areas.
- d) The report does not indicate how many people of each racial and ethnic group were served and in what programs.
- e) A project can encompass one or more programs; however, it cannot state the specific number of communities that were served.
- f) The Project intent to be a collection of programs collectively and to bring about mental health outcomes for defined priority populations.

II. The following is a synopsis of the CLCC comments:

- a) There has been a change in terminology. A project is now called a program and a program is now called an activity.
- b) DMH/MHSOAC changed this terminology when the annual updates were released.

- c) MHSOAC Counsel explained that the change in terminology was due to the passage of AB 5xxx which amended Welfare and Institutions Code section 5847 to provide for expedited funding of previously approved programs.
- d) The MHSOAC wanted to work on next year's demographic reporting requirement with a report that would have occurred in January – February release. To date, this has not occurred.
- e) A member stated that he is hoping for an opportunity for the CLCC to provide input into the structure of the data requirements for next year.
- f) Data elements are still undefined and unassigned.
- g) Do counties do any evaluation of their PEI Plans?
- h) Can RDA segregate the data and break the data down by reporting unit?
- i) Does anyone have a sense of the quality of the data being collected by counties on race and ethnicity?
- j) How is RDA billing?

VII. Review of the Public Mental Health Cultural Competence Committee's Matrix

CLCC member Rachel Guerrero provided an overview of the Public Mental Health Cultural Competence Committee's Matrix regarding. The follow were the salient points:

- a) The matrix included information from eight existing committees that address racial, ethic and also monitor cultural competence and disparity issues.
- b) The Committees are: MHSOAC CLCC, California Mental Health Directors Association Social Justice Advisory Committee, State Interagency team Workgroup to Eliminate Disparities, DMH office of Multicultural Services, DMH Cultural Competence Advisory Committee, California Mental Planning Council Cultural Competence Committee and California Mental Health Directors Association Ethnic Services Committee.
- c) The work of these committees is to ensure the voices of multicultural communities are heard.
- d) All the committees agree on the of lack of data for multicultural communities and the need to improve data reporting for reducing disparities.
- e) DMH agreed to modify the plan requirements.
- f) In November 2009, DMH submitted the modified plan and it is still under review by the Small County Directors Committee.
- g) The next step is to do a complete analysis of the different groups and identify the gaps and similarities.

CLCC member comments:

- a) Members thanked CLCC member Rachel Guerrero and her staff person Autumn Valerio for their hard work in putting together these documents.
- b) A general observation was made that communication between the identified committees needs to occur.

Public Comment:

Jim Gilmer voiced the need to find an intersection of regional and formal groups that work on this issue to broaden the mosaic of cultural competence.

Action: Members were asked to read these documents thoroughly before the next meeting and be prepared to discuss, ask questions and provide input.

VIII: Announcement/Update of DMH Release of New Cultural Competence Plan Requirements

CLCC member Rachel Guerrero provided an overview regarding the Release of the Cultural Competency Plan Requirements. The following is a synopsis of her presentation:

- a) In January 2010, DMH issued the third revision of the cultural competence plan requirements to counties and has just completed the third regional training.
- b) The last Cultural Competency Plan submitted was in 2004 and was slowed down by to the roll out of the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA).
- c) DMH reviews, scores and approves all cultural competency plans.
- d) The plans are due in July 28, 2010.
- e) A logic model assessment was used
- f) There are eight criterion used which are based on the National Research of Organizational Cultural Competency Assessment.
- g) Some small counties have asked DMH to modify the cultural competency plan requirements, stating that they are too cumbersome for small populations.

CLCC member appreciated the update and were pleased with the release of the requirements.

IX. Review 2003-04 and 2006-07 Disparity Reports

CLCC members discussed the reports. The following is a synopsis of the discussion:

- a) Can the charts be blended and placed side to side?
- b) Are there any changes in the base data regarding the penetration rates?
- c) The charts do not give a good sense of how race and ethnicity are defined.
- d) Can the CLCC submit a document requesting better data collection?

Action: CLCC members Rhett-Mariscal and Aguilar-Gaxiola will meet and discuss developing a document to ask the necessary questions to clarify the information on these reports.

X. Cultural and Ethnic Communities Workgroup Report on selection options for Ethnic/Cultural Presentations

CLCC Committee Consultant Peter Best provided an overview of the two workgroup meetings that were held. The following is a synopsis of the overview:

- a) In the first meeting on February 22, 2010, CLCC members Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola and CLCC Committee Consultant Peter Best brainstormed on how to select communities to present at future CLCC meetings.
- b) What is the goal of the selection process?
- c) Develop a candidate list of possible communities that may be candidates to present
- d) Indicate which ones have already presented and which ones have not
- e) Determine the statewide stakeholders.

- f) Determine which communities tend to be most visible and invisible?
- g) Should the selection begin with the first five groups for Reducing Disparities Project?
- h) What will be the CLCC relationship be in this process?
- i) Determine the subgroups within the unrepresented groups.
- j) Do we target groups that tend to be invisible?
- k) What do we know about underserved groups?

2. At the second meeting held on March 25, 2010, the attendees included CLCC members Hiramoto, Alejandre and CLCC Committee Consultant Best. This meeting was held in an attempt to get input from the other workgroup members that were not able to attend the first meeting. The following is a synopsis of that discussion:

- a) Workgroup members discussed the history of presentations previously offered at the CLCC meetings.
- b) There were two presentations, the first by the Native American Community and the second by the Hmong Community.
- c) Members felt that while the communities provided good information, the CLCC did not establish clear goals and expectations for the presenters. This resulted in a misunderstanding of what support and action the CLCC could provide. (Lack of structure)
- d) Members asked why the CLCC was proposing to have presentations? Was this agreed upon at the January meeting?
- e) The CLCC Committee Consultant replied that the CLCC Charter states: "The CLCC will invite specific cultural and ethnic communities to each CLCC meeting to discuss their perspective and participation. The CLCC will collect and discuss issues and determine which issues should be presented at the MHSOAC (October 2010) meeting."
- f) The Charter has not been approved by the committee and is on the April agenda for approval.
- g) Members felt that before proceeding, there needs to be parameters established
- h) What is the Goal/Purpose of the presentations?
- i) Will the presentations be made to the CLCC or the Commission?
- j) Is it to educate the Commissioners on the needs and experiences of the unserved, underserved and inappropriately served cultural and linguistic communities?
- k) To instruct how the MHSA has affected these communities both positively and negatively?
- l) What will be the follow-up?
- m) Why should communities want to make presentations? What's the benefit?
- n) Is reimbursement of travel expenses available to communities that make presentations?

Action: Provide update to the CLCC members regarding the workgroup discussions and ask the following questions before proceeding:

- a) **Is the role of the CLCC to ensure meaningful engagement of cultural and linguistic communities within the MHSA?**
- b) **How can the CLCC support the Commission to foster future engagement of cultural and linguistic communities?**

XI. Discussion on work with other MHSOAC Committees to ensure Cultural Competence

The following is a synopsis of the discussion:

- a) Some of the Committees have common issues and concerns.
- b) The CLCC seems isolated from the other Committees.
- c) Cultural competency should be a universal theme that is discussed by all committees with each other.
- d) There need to be a process where Committees collaborate and share information.

Public Comment:

Stephanie Welch stated that the MHSOAC Committee Consultants should have regular meetings to ensure information sharing is being fostered. Having consensus Committees recommendations would wield more power to committees. Why would a Committee make a recommendation and another oppose it.?

Action: Due to time limitations, this discussion will be contemplated at the April CLCC meeting.

XII. Suggested topics for next meeting

- a) Invite RDA to make a presentation.
- b) Complete workgroup discussion.
- c) Complete discussion of Cultural Competency Matrix.

XIII. General Public Comment

The National Asian and Pacific Islander Mental Health Association will hold a public forum on May 15, 2010 in San Jose. The topic will be National Health Care Reform.

The Center for Multi- Cultural Development has a Community Based Organization (CBO) Capacity Building Project for ethnic and Cultural CBO'S. They are soliciting help identifying CBO's that need support. Technical assistance and formal trainings is available to help CBO's engage the MHSA process.

Meeting Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:10 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Peter W. Best