

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION (MHSOAC)
Evaluation Committee Meeting
July 7, 2010
MHSOAC Conference Room
1300 17th Street, Suite 1000
Sacramento, CA 95811
1:30 p.m. to 5:00 p.m.**

Committee Members Present:

Larry Poaster, Committee Chair
Richard Van Horn, Committee Vice Chair
Howard Kahn, Committee Vice Chair
Stephanie Welch, CMHDA
Tim Smith, representing Commissioner Howard Kahn, Committee Vice Chair – **(Phone)**
Kathleen Derby, NAMI California
Toby Ewing, CRB
Wendy Wang, Pacific Clinics – **(Phone)**
Ann Arneill-Py, CMHPC
Stephanie Oprendeck, California Institute of Mental Health (CiMH)
Karen Hart, UACF – **(Phone)**
Denise Hunt, Stanislaus County Behavioral Health & Recovery Services
David Pilon, Mental Health America of Los Angeles – **(Phone)**
Harriet Markell, CA Council of Community Mental Health Agencies
Anthony Delgado, Orange County Health Care Agency (OCHCA)

MHSOAC Staff:

Carol Hood
Sherri Gauger
Norma Pate
Beverly Whitcomb
Filomena Yeroshek
Sandy Lyon

Other Attendees:

Rebecca Brown, Program Associate, RDA
Steve Leoni, Client Advocate -- **(Phone)**
Edward Walker, CAL MHSA
Eric Zuniga, MCT Health – **(Phone)**
Jayne Wiebold, CRB
Raphael Metzger, UACF
Stacie Hiramoto, REMHDCO
Mike Reiter, APS
Senka Gupta, APS
Viviana Criado, CEMHAC – **(Phone)**
Raul Sanchez – **(Phone)**.
David Gorn – **(Phone)**
Lin Benjamin, Dept. of Aging

Sheree Kruckenberg, CHA
Delphine Brody, CA Network Mental Health Clients—(Phone)

Members Absent:

Marc Grimm, DMH Technical Advisor (not a member)
Kelvin Lee, Ret. Superintendent
Michele Curran, Client Advocate

I. Welcome/Introductions/Comments

Larry Poaster, Chair convened the meeting at 1:38 p.m.

Members and attendees introduced themselves individually.

The Chair informed members that it has been a time consuming three year journey with various administrative and budgetary challenges, since the Commission adopted the concept paper of May 2008 that provided the framework for MHSA evaluation. He noted that RDA, the Phase I contract provider, has done their work. He further commented there is no way to evaluate all five components of the MHSA and all aspects and values related to it, and that this is to be a first start as the Commission implements it's responsibility of evaluation regarding effectiveness. Since there is minimal information available regarding data and outcomes, and this is the first step of an on-going process, the Chair noted that each step will lead to the next incrementally and that was the intent of the original concept that is currently being operationalized. He commented that from the original \$1.5 ML available funding, RDA was allocated \$100K, and the remaining \$400K, from Fiscal Year 2009-10, has reverted back to the fund, with \$1ML remaining in the current Fiscal Year to fund this effort. He also advised to act swiftly without risking another reversion.

II. Review and Approve Minutes from June 2, 2010 meeting

The minutes of the June 2, 2010 meeting were approved by the Committee.

III. PowerPoint Presentation of MHSA Evaluation Component

Carol Hood presented a PowerPoint that provided an overview summary of the MHSA Evaluation component and a brief history regarding the evolution of the Phase II Scope of Work development and actions that occurred at previous meetings. The Committee discussed the revised draft RFP outline dated, June 15, 2010, for the MHSA Evaluation, prepared by RDA that includes the Scope of Work and Proposer Qualifications. Ms. Hood facilitated a discussion that included the following comments:

- The Committee reached consensus in the following subject categories that were agreed to be key concerns:
 1. Data quality and timeliness
 2. Context
 3. Funding level is not enough to address all priorities for evaluation
 4. Ensure Feedback Loop (data for Quality Improvement)
document minimum standards for Consumer Quality Improvement with recommendations
 5. MHSOAC has a limited role in improving data

6. Periodic reporting of relevant data and proof in concept documentation

- The Committee members commented on the lack of clean data available and reached consensus that there are concerns of data quality issues
- The Chair indicated that it's not the Commission's responsibility to create valid data systems; There was Committee consensus on this issue
- The costs associated with doing a meta-analysis will exceed the available funding so consensus was reached that funding is not sufficient, and a transition plan of the sequence of what needs to happen next and a specific time line will be necessary
- The Committee agreed that the evaluator should make recommendations regarding costs and resources needed for next steps
- The recommendation was provided to use a different term regarding the "meta-analysis" to better describe the intent, and the Committee agreed on this
- A suggestion was made that the data reported needs to be ensured of accuracy and of quality and that could be costly beyond current available funding
- The data the counties currently provide does not cycle back to them so they aren't informed of what data needs cleaning and at what point old data should be cleaned
- The Committee was unable to agree that minimum standards were clear
- A comment was made that it needs to be clear as to what the minimum expectations are in the scope of work and what is optional, so the provider can be responsive
- The Chair stated to beware not to get into a circular data loop where nothing gets accomplished
- It is preferred that the evaluation reports show how to move forward so it is useful and important for clients regarding improved quality outcomes
- A recommendation was made that to preserve some flexibility, the evaluation design may need to be adapted during the evaluation.
- It was noted that since counties have their own dashboard reports that are web-based, quarterly reports at the statewide and county levels based on the California Mental Health Planning Council (CMHPC) prioritized indicators, should be one of the deliverables of the evaluation
- A suggestion was made to use the bulk of funds to analyze existing data instead of reporting on other existing evaluations
- It was noted that the measure of family, consumer involvement in the process is not reflected in outcomes and these values should be included in the commitment of moving forward with consideration of the following next steps:
 1. What's been learned
 2. What's been done, rather than create a new strategy
 3. How was it done
 4. What has worked
- The MHSA values need to be embedded throughout the evaluation.

- A recommendation was provided to be consistent when using the term Evaluator/Proposer
- It was recommended that a Business Associate Agreement be established between the DMH, MHSOAC and contractor to ensure appropriate roles and responsibilities associated with use of data
- Any additional comments on the RDA outline must be submitted to Sandy Lyon by July 14, 2010 and will be posted to the MHSOAC website and will be considered at the July 29th Commission meeting.
- Staff agreed to consider all technical comments in the writing of the RFP.
- A summary outline with recommendations from the Evaluation Committee will be developed by staff and presented to the Commission in July, 2010. (see attached)

IV. Preliminary Discussion of Future Evaluation Efforts

This agenda item was not discussed by the Committee due to lack of time available during the meeting.

V. Public Comment

Steve Leoni thanked the Committee for all their thoroughness.

VI. Two agenda items will be discussed at the next committee meeting:

- Preliminary Discussion of Future Evaluation Efforts
- Draft Policy Document on MHSOAC Focus on Oversight, Accountability and Evaluation

The next meeting date will be announced once it becomes established and members will be notified of the date and time.

Larry Poaster, Chair, adjourned the meeting at 5:17 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sandy Lyon