

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES  
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION (MHSOAC)  
Evaluation Committee  
Conference Room 74-155  
1616 Capitol Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
February 23, 2011  
1:30 P.M. to 4:30 P.M.**

**Committee Members Present:**

Richard Van Horn, Chair  
David Pating, Vice Chair  
Viviana Criado  
Debbie Innes-Gomberg  
Dawn Williams  
Dave Pilon  
Karyn Dresser  
Steve Leoni  
Ann Arneill-Py  
Harriet Markell  
Rusty Selix  
Stephanie Oprendek  
Denise Hunt \*  
Candace Milow \*  
Tim Smith \*  
Toby Ewing \*  
Loran Sheley \* (Technical Advisor from DMH)  
\*Participated via telephone

**Staff:**

Carol Hood  
Sandy Lyon  
Deborah Lee  
Filomena Yeroshek  
Sherri Gauger  
Kevin Hoffman

**Other Attendees:**

Stephanie Welch  
Stacie Hiramoto \*

**Welcome/Introductions**

Commissioner Van Horn convened the meeting at approximately 1:30 p.m.

- All meeting participants were welcomed, introduced themselves, and stated their affiliation.
- Commissioner Van Horn welcomed everyone for their participation on the Evaluation Committee and outlined the structure of the meeting.

**Review and Approve Prior Meeting Minutes**

There were no prior meeting minutes available for approval.

**Discuss & Adopt Committee Ground Rules**

Commissioner Van Horn reviewed Tab 2 which included an outline for Developing Committee Ground Rules.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - Committee members agreed the addition of ground rules are to ensure open, free conversation without risk of negative repercussions
  - Committee adopted the seven (7) suggested ground rules that were included in the meeting packet

- Commissioner Van Horn gave staff the charge to memorialize the agreed upon ground rules
- No public comments were made on this issue.

### **Evaluation Activity Update of Current and Future Deliverables**

Commissioner Van Horn introduced Tab 3 which included an update provided by Sandy Lyon of current and future contract deliverables.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - The Evaluation Committee strongly agrees that the contract deliverables provided should lead to quality improvement strategies.
  - The data to be collected should be used for continuous quality improvement.
  - Each evaluative phase will build on the previous and the outcomes that result will be used by the committee to determine next steps.
  - Most committee members expressed the view that the priorities for evaluation will be determined by what is learned and a mechanism for continual reporting.

Commissioner Van Horn thanked staff for the presentation and thanked all committee participants for their comments. Staff was requested to provide the matrix of the presentation electronically and to post the reports.

- Public comment was allowed and incorporated in with the committee member discussion

### **Discuss Work Plan for Charter**

Commissioner Van Horn introduced Tab 4 which included a discussion of recommended monthly committee activities that Carol Hood facilitated.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - The role of the committee and it's priorities should be structured by a framework.
  - The changes in the MHSA through the Budget and Trailer Bill will impact the work of the proposed Data and Reporting Workgroup.
  - The Evaluation Committee should be guided by the principles of continuous quality improvement.

Commissioner Van Horn thanked staff and all committee participants for their input.

- No public comments were made on this issue

### **Discuss Evaluation Framework**

Commissioner Van Horn introduced Tab 5 and lead the discussion regarding the purpose and the scope of the evaluation framework.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - It is important the framework be inclusive of a transformative context that captures an on-going approach.

- There are currently existing frameworks that could serve as models to be used that provide methodologies, indicators and examples of successful already mapped out processes. As an example, the committee considered the U.S. General Accountability Office (GAO) report and the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) frameworks.
  - The adopted Accountability Policy paper from November 2010 included a focus on data as a priority that should now highlight quality improvement resulting on outcome measures as a priority for the framework.
  - There was consensus among members that the following concepts should be included in the evaluations:
    - Strategy
    - Risk Adjustment
    - Achievement standards
    - Progress related to outcome variables initially established
  - A Quality Improvement framework was outlined for consideration as part of oversight and accountability responsibility.
  - Staff will send out a draft evaluation framework and get recommendations from committee members that will be included in the draft to be presented at the next committee meeting.
- No public comments were made on this issue

**General Public Comment**

- No general public comments were made.

**Next meeting**

April 20, 2011

1300 17<sup>th</sup> Street, Sacramento CA, Suite 1000

**Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.