

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION (MHSOAC)
Services Committee
CIMH
2125 19th Street
Sacramento, CA 95818
March 30, 2010
9:30 a.m. to 1:30 p.m.**

Committee Members Present:

David Pating
Beth Gould
Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola
Fran Edelstein
Don Edmondson
James Gilmer
Sandra Goodwin
Mary Hale
Terri Restelli-Deits
Betsy Sheldon
Hiep Ma
Celeste Hunter*
Janice Rollins-Dean*
Karen Todoroff*

Staff:

Dee Lemonds
Ann Collentine
Vivian Lee

Other Attendees:

Stephanie Welch
Rebecca Brown
Stacie Hiramoto
Lin Benjamin
Kathleen Derby
Jenny Qian
Nancy Cartar
Monica Nepomuceno
Filomena Yeroshek
Beverly Whitcomb
Carol Hood
Monika Grass

*Participated via telephone

Welcome/Introductions

David Pating, Committee Co-Chair, convened the meeting at 9:45 a.m.

- All meeting participants introduced themselves.

Updates:

Issuing Guidelines for PEI Statewide Funds

David Pating previewed upcoming Services issues for 2010 and informed members that the PEI Statewide Projects Guidelines were out and copies were available.

Questions came up regarding the Student Mental Health Initiative. Beth Gould replied that the SMHI Planning committee was being reconvened and the tentative date was in late April. Beth Gould mentioned that any revisions to the SMHI would be limited and that one proposed change was that the match requirement would go away for higher education.

A question was asked, "what is CalMHSA?" Staff responded that the California Mental Health Services Authority (CalMHSA) is a joint powers authority formed by counties to administer projects for member counties acting jointly including to implement PEI Statewide Projects.

Committee Charter

David Pating presented the Services Charter as approved by the Commission and discussed upcoming issues on the charter. There was discussion about preparing as a Committee to participate and contribute to the work on the MHSA Integrated Plan proposed to take effect in 2012-13. There was a suggestion that MHSA Coordinators be engaged in this effort. A question was asked about the formation of a joint subcommittee with evaluation and whether CFLC and CLCC Committees should be added. The question was deferred until more decisions were

made on the functions of a Services/Evaluation subcommittee if one is formed. Staff will meet with staff from the Evaluations Committee to discuss what makes sense.

Committee Input re: Plan Reviews and Program Implementation

David Pating opened a general discussion on Plan Review and Implementation.

Issues discussed included:

- Concern expressed that there appears to be less involvement of stakeholders evident in the plans
- Question about what the best indicators are for stakeholder involvement
- Concern expressed that it appears some stakeholders are burning out and we need new players
- Comment that quantity and quality of stakeholder involvement varies, some counties are doing a great job. It might be best to replicate best county models
- Comment about the importance of having the on-going involvement of non-traditional stakeholders
- Suggestion that it might be valuable to measure the PEI and INN funds distributed to non-traditional partners.
- Concern expressed about PEI Reviewers not seeing underrepresented communities strongly represented in plans
- Question of how best programs are being replicated
- Concern expressed that some small counties are not able to do a thorough job on plans
- Comment that one County did five gender/ethnic focus groups with evidence-based practices
- Comment that some counties are making an attempt at broader outreach
- Comment that Riverside and San Bernardino are doing a good job at bringing multi-cultural groups together
- Comment that of 51 PEI Plans reviewed 7 counties had no older adult programs
- Comment that counties can provide more services if the dollars are flexible and allowed to be combined
- Comment that CMHDA wants more flexibility between components especially in the next three years
- Question about whether the allocation formula for MHSA funds is fixed or could be revisited
- Comment about fiscal crisis driving everything
- Concern about PEI Implementation being slow
- Comment about PEI having more professionals involved in stakeholder process because of expanded partners
- Comment that reversion is a big concern
- Comment about the impact on Adult Protective Services (APS) as a result of older parolees aging out of jail and being released into communities
- Request that the OAC post information about County Plans

Presentation and Discussion of MHSA Evaluation Efforts by DMH, the MHSOAC and the California Mental Health Planning Council (CMHPC)

Dee Lemonds presented a Power Point on evaluations done by DMH for AB 2034 programs focusing on how that evaluation effort set the stage for the DMH evaluation of persons served in MHSA Full Service Partnership (FSP) programs. Additional information was provided on the most recent outcome data summarized by DMH on MHSA FSP programs and news about DMH being close to publishing a report with more recent and comprehensive FSP outcome information.

Rebecca Brown of Research Development Associates presented a Power Point on Phase I of the MHSOAC sponsored MHSA Evaluation. Phase I is focused on:

- interviewing and surveying stakeholders about: what is currently happening in their counties with regards to evaluation and data reporting to DMH, and what they see as an appropriate role for statewide evaluation that would be helpful to their county.
- Researching best practices
- Researching data availability and access
- Writing Requests for Proposals for Phase II, the actual MHSA evaluation

Carol Hood presented a brief update on the priority indicators developed by the California Mental Health Planning Council (CMHPC).

Due to time constraints the discussion which followed the presentations was very limited. Issues discussed included:

- Question about who will analyze data from MHSA
- The Evaluation Committee is looking at PEI and what should be evaluated
- Comment about the importance of staying with the indicators which are mentioned in the MHSA
- Comment that counties are looking for guidance on PEI impact measures
- Comment about not needing to reinvent everything and suggesting that staff look into how the Alcohol and Drug Programs added “prevention” to CAL-OMS (California Outcome Measurement System)
- Question about how evaluations will measure whether there is a change in the systems of care
- Question about whether the client/family voice is being captured in evaluations? Suggestion that evaluators may want to use existing data but revise the instruments used.
- Comment that veterans are not identified in FSP data
- Comment that there is no summary information currently available about the PEI Training and Capacity Building effort.

Public Comment:

Commissioner Pating asked if there was public comment. No public comments were made.

Discussion of Technical Assistance Document for Review at Next Committee Meeting:

Commissioner Pating informed members of the committee that at our next meeting we would be discussing Training and Technical Assistance unless PEI or INN draft regulations are ready for the committee to discuss. Dr. Pating asked Committee members to read the MHSOAC’s “Mental Health Services Act Technical Assistance and Training Policy” adopted by the Commission in 2008. Comment made that the template used for the review of PEI Plans could also be a place to start this discussion.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 1:30 P.M.