

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES  
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION (MHSOAC)  
Evaluation Committee  
Conference Room 74-155  
1616 Capitol Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
June 22, 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  
Tim Smith  
Dave Pilon  
Karyn Dresser\*  
Steve Leoni  
Ann Arneill-Py  
Harriet Markell  
Rusty Selix  
Stephanie Oprendek  
Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola\*  
Kathleen Derby  
Toby Ewing  
Donna Ewing Marto\*  
Denise Hunt  
Candace Milow\*  
Kate Cordell (Technical Advisor from DMH)

**Staff:**

Carol Hood  
Sandy Lyon  
Deborah Lee  
Filomena Yeroshek  
Sherri Gauger  
Kevin Hoffman  
Aaron Carruthers  
Enrica Bertoldo

**Other Attendees:**

Commissioner Poaster  
Stacie Hiramoto  
Theresa Ly  
Michele Peterson  
Dave Jensen

\*Participated via telephone

**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 agenda for the meeting noting that evaluation is at the center of the Commission's oversight and accountability role. Carol Hood will facilitate the discussion items.

**Review and Approve Prior Meeting Minutes**

The minutes were approved as written.

**Update Evaluation Activities**

Staff provided the brief overview of evaluation activities that are current and future activities to come.

- Highlights of the briefing:
  - Phase 2 Evaluation requires UCLA to develop quarterly standardized county level reports on priority indicators for CSS. The initial statewide

- draft report template is due June 30, 2011 and will include documentation of the methods for compiling data.
- The priority indicators were approved by the California Mental Health Planning Council (CMHPC) and the MHSOAC to begin to measure the progress toward statutory outcomes. UCLA is proposing some additional indicators.
  - The draft report will be available for public input before it is finalized.

### **Discussion on Quality Data Reporting**

A presentation was provided by Dave Pilon of an approach to evaluation that provides for continuous quality improvement.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - A comment was made that It is critical for quality improvement to get data that is meaningful to providers
  - It was noted that the measurement of data should be comparable by using benchmark efforts so when the data is collected it is useful for reporting best practices
  - The purpose of an electronic health record is to better roll up outcomes so information can be articulated to providers and other mental health representatives
  - It was recommended that the comparison of data needs to consider context so its use can provide measureable results
  - When benchmarking is applied to data it is intended to set a comparable standard for the purpose of tracking changes as a result of actions
  - It was noted that data entry errors reveal limits in the system and are not always a true reflection of quality of outcomes
  
- Public comment was received and incorporated in with the committee member discussion

### **Update on Data Quality Workgroup**

Staff provided the committee with an update which included a discussion of activities regarding the Data Quality Workgroup.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - The workgroup convened on June 1, 2011 as a result of the committee motion at the April 20<sup>th</sup> meeting and determined as a short term solution, to recommend a contract to address the data quality needs of the Data Collecting and Reporting (DCR) system.
  - There is one time administrative MHSOAC funding that must be encumbered by 6/30/11 in the amount of \$360 K. The decision was made to use this one time funding for an evaluation priority for existing technical issues with the current DCR system in order to obtain accurate and reliable data.
  - The Commission will vote on this proposed contract at its June 24, 2011 teleconference meeting.

Commissioner Van Horn thanked staff and the Workgroup participants for their efforts.

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

### **Initial Discussion on FY 2011-12 MHSOAC Evaluation Priorities**

Staff lead the discussion regarding evaluation priorities for use of the remaining evaluation funds available for FY 2011-12.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - A recommendation was made to work with the External Quality Review Organization (EQRO) to eliminate any potential duplication of evaluation efforts that are already being done. This may not require additional funding
  - It was suggested to move toward a quality improvement focus by analyzing available data and the use of the data but not expecting to have immediate solutions considering that other funding sources will become available to continue efforts
  - A priority was suggested to spend funds on ensuring good data and to analyze the costs associated with collecting data so reported outcomes are meaningful
  - A recommendation was provided that there should be a visual representation of what evaluation means so there is uniform collection of data by counties and to include client and family member driven decisions as a leading factor in evaluations
  - A comment was made that there is a need for a system that relies on performance data that can improve the availability of services and service improvements that could possibly integrate existing databases to lead to standardized ways of collecting information
  - It was suggested that a quality improvement approach should guide the evaluation as the work already authorized for UCLA has shown that there is a need for clean data
  - There was a recommendation to build a PEI framework so data can be compared nationally
  - The importance of a strategic plan that includes an analysis that is critical for the interpretation of data was recommended.

Toby Ewing presented additional comments regarding evaluation priorities for consideration.

- Highlights of the discussion
  - The Commission needs to be guided by what information is needed by decision makers and then should prioritize the evaluations to obtain the needed information
  - As next step recommendations regarding outcomes of the MHSA (Act), it was advised to meet with key policy makers to learn what they want to know
  - Comments were made that the clients and family members are the audience for the evaluation results and thus they should be the ones consulted

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

### **Discussion on Proposed Legislation, SB 893**

Toby Ewing lead the discussion regarding the recent amendment to SB 893.

- Highlights of the discussion
  - The bill was amended to apply only to mental health, child welfare, adult protective services and substance abuse which are the areas affected by realignment. The bill requires the California Health and Human Services Agency to establish a review system of these programs.
  - It's not clear the impact the absence of the Alcohol and Drug Program (ADP) and the Department of Mental Health (DMH) will have on the counties.
  - The next legislative hearing by the Senate Finance Committee regarding the bill is scheduled for July 6, 2011.

### **Set Preliminary Agenda for August 24<sup>th</sup> Meeting**

Status of realignment

#### **Next meeting**

August 24, 2011 at 1:30 to 4:30 p.m.

Location to be determined.

#### **Adjournment**

Meeting was adjourned at 4:30 p.m.