

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION (MHSOAC)**

Cultural and Linguistic Competence Committee

June 14, 2011

1500 Capitol Mall

Hearing Room 72.165

Sacramento, CA 95814

10:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m.

Committee Members Present:

Richard Van Horn, Chair
Rocco Cheng
Stacie Hiramoto
Jo Ann Johnson
Will Rhett-Mariscal
Gwen Slattery
Amber Burkan
Raja Mitry
Viviana Criado
Delphine Brody

Staff :

Kevin Hoffman
Filomena Yeroshek
Jose Oseguera
Peter Best
Sandy Lyon

Others Attendees:

Corrina Rhett
Autumn Valario
Abby Lubowe
Claire Sallie
Elizabeth Harris
Kathleen Derby
Carmen Diaz

Reading of Committee Ground Rules

Richard Van Horn, Committee Chair, convened the meeting at 8:04 A.M.

- Chair asked the membership to silently read the committee ground rules
- Chair requested that the attendees review the April 20, 2011 minutes while they waited for more members to arrive

Tab 1 Review and Approve Minutes of February 16, 2011

The April 20, 2011 minutes were presented to the committee for approval.

The minutes were approved by consensus.

Welcome/Introductions

- Since a majority of the membership arrived, the chair asked for introductions be made
- Committee and public members introduced themselves

Tab 2 CLCC/CFLC Community Forum Workgroup – Placer and Upcoming Forum Updates

The following are the discussion highlights:

- The chair asked CLCC members, who are part of the Community Forum Workgroup, to share their reflections on the Placer Community Forum

- A Workgroup member stated that the structure of the forum needs to be modified to ensure confidentiality and to prevent retaliation. They believe that individuals need to feel comfortable in providing feedback.
- Another Workgroup member stated that the seating configuration, where workgroup members are seated behind the table, felt uncomfortable and it seemed like an “us versus them” atmosphere. The seating format needs to encourage a more collaborative environment.
- A suggestion was made that maybe breakout tables would be helpful. These breakout groups will make it a more welcoming environment.
- A suggestion was made to have three or four breakout groups. Option 1: Clients and family members; county staff and providers. Option 2: Separate them all (model for Los Angeles) Clients, family members, county staff and providers. The CLCC should defer to the CFLC as to the number of breakout groups and how the groups are separated.
- A comment was made that breakout groups sound like a good idea, but shouldn't we learn to work together?
- A comment was made that we need to create a space where people feel safe and have the ability to feel included and accepted
- Multiple comments were made that the breakout groups should report questionnaire answers to the full group
- A suggestion was made that a nicely worded letter should be sent to counties notifying them that their presence might cause some individuals to be less open and more reluctance if the county director is in attendance
- A comment was made that some monolingual communities rely on staff for support, so there needs to be flexibility for county staff participation.
- The Chair stated that as a committee, the CLCC needs to make recommendations that will be presented to the Community Forum Workgroup at the afternoon's meeting

Action: The Chair will inform the Community Forum Workgroup that the CLCC recommends revising the Community Forum structure by incorporating three or four breakout groups (clients, family members, county staff, and providers). MHSOAC staff will do a quick evaluation before the forum begins and depending on the number of attendees, will decide how many breakout groups are needed.

Tab 3 Update from MHSOAC Evaluation Committee Regarding Evaluation Efforts

Sandy Lyon provided a presentation on the Evaluation effort and Elizabeth Harris, Ph.D., followed with a PowerPoint regarding Participatory Evaluation and the Performance Monitoring System.

- A comment was made that cultural communities are not represented in Full Service Partnerships (FSP)

- It was suggested that the information gathered through the Data Collection and Reporting (DCR) and the Client and Service Information (CSI) systems need cleansing
- A comment was made that cultural communities don't see themselves as included especially, when clients and family members are only listed
- Question: What are the three counties that have Disparities Contracts with University of California, Davis?
- Answer: The three counties are Orange, Stanislaus and Santa Clara counties
- Multiple comments were made that more time should have been allotted for the first two steps of the "Recommended Framework for Program Evaluation." Engaging stakeholders and describing the program are the critical elements for an effective evaluation.
- A comment was made that we need to take a more detailed look at gaps and next steps. Maybe Professor Sergio Gaxiola could provide a presentation on his research and the membership could provide some input?
- The Chair stated that Professor Gaxiola's research was already complete and it was too late to provide additional feedback
- It was noted that the disaggregation of data is an issue that needs to be addressed

Tab 4 Review and Discuss Updated Disparity Reports Compiled by DMH

The following are the discussion highlights:

- Staff stated that the 2008-09 penetration and retention data will not be available from DMH until the end of June
- A comment was made that the DMH charts are hard to read and some of the data may be corrupted due to some counties submitting the data late. A comparative chart that spans at least a couple of years, with a summary and background, would be more useful.
- Staff will contact DMH and ask if the data can be displayed as comparative charts
- A comment was made that Arab Americans are not included in the analysis
- The Chair stated that this is a problem that exists all over the country. Currently, most of the data is based on the Threshold Languages. Money would be needed to fund research on sub-populations and this committee would need to identify what the ethnic categories would be.
- The Committee was in concurrence that there is a need to disaggregate data in order to understand the disparities within the unidentified and sub-populations reported in the "other" category
- The Chair wondered how granular do we want this information to be. Currently, the Holzer Targets do not identify what populations are being considered under the category of "other." The Holzer data may be out dated and additional research is needed.

- The Chair asked if anyone on the Committee knew someone who could disaggregate this data?
- A comment was made that some counties have the ability to collect more granulated data, but the state data collection system needs to be updated in order to capture this information
- MHSOAC counsel stated that the MHSOAC is currently attempting to hire a research scientist, but it is proving difficult due to the state hiring freeze

Tab 5 Discuss/Plan Cultural Competency Training and Select Workgroup Members

The following are the discussion highlights:

- Question: Did the CLCC request feedback from Commissioners regarding what type of training will meet their needs?
- Staff stated that a draft set of questions was submitted to the Chair, but we have not received a response
- The Chair stated that he may have missed the request, but the Committee can discuss the questions now
- It was noted that the training should be fun and provide a basic understanding of cultural competence, but nothing insulting. The training should promote respect for different cultures.
- A response noted that the training should be relevant to the work of the Commission
- A statement was made that “culture” is a protective shield for racial and ethnic communities
- A comment was made that a one hour, once a year training is not enough. The information that needs to be imparted requires more time.
- A public member noted that Commissioners could benefit by attending a community event that is separate from their culture and perhaps report on the information
- A Committee member agreed that motivational viewing might be a good idea. However, the training may need to provide a training/motivational mixture of training and motivational viewing and be non-threatening. Making the training fun was the key.
- A suggestion was made that site visits could be used as a component of the training maybe in Sacramento during the Commission meeting in November
- A public member asked to know if the training was constrained to one hour and to the yearly requirement?
- A comment was made that that there were all good ideas, but maybe a process recommendation would be helpful. The training should have a learning objective with choices and the objectives should be mapped out to improve awareness and understanding of culture.

- The chair suggested that maybe the training should focus on disparities; especially, in the manner in which data is collected. The Commissioners need to know what they can do to improve the mental health system.
- The membership concurred that training on data disparities and the need to disaggregate information would be an interesting training topic
- A workgroup was formed, comprised of the following CLCC members: Mitry, Burkan, Criado, Slattery and Rhett-Mariscal (Chair). Claire Sallie (DMH, Office of Multi-Cultural Services) will be a consultant to the workgroup. This workgroup will meet and update the CLCC membership on the training curriculum for the August 17, ²⁰¹¹ meeting.

Tab 6 Review and Discuss Documents Translation Criteria and Vetting Process

The following are the discussion highlights:

- The Committee reviewed the draft process for vetting translated documents
- Question: Are we attempting to develop principles?
- Question: Can the DMH Contractor come to the August 17, 2011 meeting and provide input into their process to ensure quality translations? What is their internal process?
- Question: Are the translated documents field tested?
- Claire Sallie (DMH) stated that DMH is in the process of completing a contract amendment and cannot make any changes to the contract at this time. Claire does not believe that the contractor currently uses field testing as part of their vetting process.
- A presentation from the DMH Contractor will included in the August 17, 2011 meeting agenda

Tab 7 AB 100 Workgroup Discussions

The following are the discussion highlights:

- The chair asked the membership what was their feeling about the report?
- A comment was made that the AB 100 report was approved by the California Mental Health Network with conditions. Additional information regarding TAY, adults, parents, youth, caregivers, and unserved communities across the lifespan needed to be included.
- A comment was made that this report was discussed at the Services Committee meeting, however it was found to be inadequate when dealing with inclusion and culture. How can we ensure inclusivity?
- Multiple comments were made stating the MHSOAC should not convene groups the exclude ethnic/racial communities. The language used also needs to be inclusive. Future workgroups should be fully inclusive and include clients, family members,

parents/caregivers, unserved and underserved racial, ethnic and cultural communities across the lifespan.

- A comment was made the CLCC should submit a motion to the Commission that full inclusion from all major stakeholder groups is required in future MHSOAC workgroups
- The Chair stated that due to limited timeframes, the MHSOAC only included stakeholder groups that had statutory obligations.
- A comment was made to request a timeline of upcoming issues that will require workgroups from the MHSOAC Executive Director
- A group of CLCC members will unofficially meet and develop a list of individuals and groups to include in future workgroups and provide a list to the CLCC Chair
- A comment was made that on Page 10 of the AB 100 Report, racial and ethnic communities are not even mentioned
- A suggestion was made that the CLCC protect the DMH office of Multi-Cultural Services from being eliminated.
- The CLCC recommends sending a motion to the Commission that the Office of Multi-Cultural Services should survive intact and remain under the DMH directorate or the highest level. The CLCC requests that the Commission vote on this matter.
- The chair asked that be item this placed on the August 17, 2011 CLCC Agenda

Future Agenda Items

- Presentation from DMH contractor regarding translation services
- Discussion on Institutional Racism and White Privilege
- Report back from CLCC Training Workgroup
- Discussion regarding the Cultural Competency Plan Requirements
- Discussion regarding possible closure of DMH's Office of Multi-Cultural Services

General Public Comment

None noted

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00 AM.

Respectfully submitted by

Peter W. Best, Staff Mental Health Specialist