



## **EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

### **MHSA Evaluation**

**RDA Recommendations regarding  
Phase II Scope of Work Outline and  
Provider Qualifications**

**July 7, 2010**

# Context

- **Urgency to move forward**
  - Initial steps in ongoing evaluation
  - Funding available for FY 10/11 and 11/12
- **Requesting additional input from Evaluation Committee**
  - Before Commission discussion and vote on **Scope of Work Outline and Provider Qualifications**
  - On **Sources of Data and Recommended Deliverables**

# Summary

- **Review history of MHSOAC evaluation efforts**
- **Overview of RDA's Phase I input process**
- **Brief summary of 6/15/10 version of Scope of Work Outline and Provider Qualification recommendations from RDA.**
- **Committee input on each section of document.**
- **Public comment**

# Brief History

- 5/2008 Evaluation concept paper approved by commission
  - Developed by Measurements and Outcomes Technical Resource Group (precursor to Evaluation Committee)
- 2/2009 Request for Proposals (RFP) for Phase I issued
- 4/2009 Contractor (RDA) selected
  - Executive Order S-09-09 issued on 6/8/09 stopped all contracts
- 9/2009 RDA contract begins
- 6/2010 RDA's Scope of Work and Provider Qualifications recommendations completed.

Note: Funding remaining available in MHSOAC budget for initial evaluation effort is \$500K/year for FY 10/11 and FY 11/12.

# Summary of Expectations From Evaluation Concept Paper

MHSOAC lead development of evaluation that is:

- Methodologically sound
- Consistent with MHSA objectives and meaningful to consumers and families
- Culturally competent
- Produces timely and consistent data reports
- Contributes to development of knowledge and competence
- Prioritizes use of existing information
- Timely

# Summary of Expectations From Phase I RFP

- Develop Scope of Work for competitive process to select Phase II contractor for
  - Overarching evaluation
  - Consistent with MHSOAC Evaluation Concept Paper
  - Based on goals outlined in MHSA
  - Using Tri-Level paradigm of client, system and community level outcomes

# Phase I Input Process

## **KEY INFORMANT INTERVIEWS WITH:**

- **California Alliance of Child and Family Services**
- **California Council of Community Health Agencies**
- **California Department of Mental Health**
- **California Institute of Mental Health**
- **California Mental Health Directors Association**
- **California Mental Health Planning Council**
- **California Network of Mental Health Clients**
- **California Research Bureau**
- **Mental Health Association in California**
- **Mental Health America of Los Angeles**
- **National Alliance of Mental Illness**
- **Petris Center**
- **Office of Senator Steinberg**
- **Telecare Corporation**
- **United Advocates for Children and Families**

# Phase I Input Process (cont.)

## County Input

### *County Representatives*

- Humboldt
- Los Angeles
- Monterey
- Orange
- Riverside
- San Bernardino
- San Diego
- Santa Clara

### *Survey Respondents*

- Alameda
- Colusa
- El Dorado
- Glen
- Inyo
- Kern
- Kings
- Madera
- Marin
- Mono
- Napa
- Orange
- Plumas
- Riverside
- Placer
- Sacramento
- San Joaquin
- Santa Cruz
- Sonoma
- Sutter
- Tulare
- Tuolumne

# Phase I Input Process (cont.)

## MHSOAC Committee Updates and Input

- Evaluation Committee
- Cultural and Linguistic Competence Committee
- Services Committee

# RDA's Recommendation Scope of Work Outline

- A. For all MHSA Components, document
  - Activities
  - Costs
- B. Measure Impact on Client and Community Outcomes
  - i. Analysis of DMH data on consumer outcomes based on Indicators prioritized by the California Mental Health Planning Council (CMHPC)
    - a. Full Service Partnerships (FSPs)
    - b. Age specific outcomes
    - c. County level data—access, penetration and appropriateness of care.
  - ii. Meta-analysis of existing evaluations of consumer outcomes
  - iii. County dashboards (based on indicators prioritized by CMHPC)

# RDA's Recommendation Scope of Work Outline (Cont.)

## C. Measure Values

- Meta-analysis of existing evaluations and studies

## D. Additional Evaluation Responsibilities

- i. Provide support for participating county representatives
- ii. Data cleaning, validation and management
- iii. Stakeholder engagement in the evaluation
  - a. Convene stakeholder advisory group
  - b. Maintain ongoing interaction with MHSOAC committees
  - c. Maintain evaluation component of MSHOAC website
- iv. Dissemination of findings from evaluation
- v. Transition Plan for on-going evaluation, monitoring and reporting

# RDA's Recommendation Proposer Qualifications

- A. Required (minimum)
  - i. 5 years experience with program evaluation
  - ii. 3 years experience work with public mental health
  - iii. Evidence of capability to manage a project of similar duration and funding
  - iv. 5 years experience with advanced data management and data analysis
  - v. Capacity to set up and work with stakeholder advisory group.
  - vi. California tax payer ID number.

# RDA's Recommendation Proposer Qualifications (cont.)

## B. Preferred

- i. Demonstrated experience with MHSA
- ii. Expertise regarding disparities in access and cultural competence in mental health systems.
- iii. Expertise regarding age-specific mental health practices
- iv. Experience accessing public datasets, including an understanding and ability to enter into MOUs for access to public data and full HIPAA compliance.
- v. Flexible, responsive, positive and cordial working style.

# RDA's Recommendation Sources of Data

## County submitted data/information

- CSI—Client and Services Information database
- DCR—Data Collections and Reporting database
- CSP—Consumer (and Family) Perception database
- Medi-Cal Claims
- MHSA plans and annual updates
- MHSA Revenue and Expenditure Reports
- Cost Reports

## DMH and MHSOAC information

- MHSA plan and annual update review tools

# RDA's Recommendation Sources of Data (Cont.)

## Reports and evaluations

- EQRO Annual Report
- MHSA evaluation findings from counties, academic institutions, foundations, contractors, and non-profits

## New data

- Interviews or focus groups
- Surveys and new data collection forms should be considered for randomly selected counties or targeted groups.

# RDA's Recommendation Deliverables

- i. Evaluation design
- ii. Quarterly progress reports
- iii. Annual Evaluation report
- iv. Website content for MHSOAC website evaluation section
- v. Dashboard reports
- vi. Dissemination Plan
- vii. Transition of responsibilities contingent on funding availability

# Input from Evaluation Committee To Commission

## Scope of Work Outline

- Are priorities for initial evaluation focus included?
- Are required products feasible within funding available?

## Proposer Qualifications

- Are proposed qualifications appropriate for scope of work?

# Input from Evaluation Committee On RFP Development

Does the list of databases address the most important sources of data?

Are the deliverables reasonable and tied to the scope of work outline?

# Next Steps

- Obtain input from Evaluation Committee
  - Summary of comments will be shared with Commission
- Commission approves Scope of Work Outline and Provider Qualifications
- Staff completes RFP
- DMH reviews RFP
- RFP released
- RFP responses due
- Intent to Award Posted
- Protests resolved, if applicable
- Contract negotiation and Contract Development
- Phase II Contract Begins