

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES  
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION (MHSOAC)  
Evaluation Committee  
Conference Room 74-155  
1616 Capitol Avenue  
Sacramento, CA 95818  
April 20, 2011  
2:00 P.M. to 5:00 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 Oprende  
Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola  
Kathleen Derby  
Toby Ewing  
Loran Sheley \* (Technical Advisor from DMH)  
Kate Cordell\* (Technical Advisor from DMH)  
Tim Croisdale\* (Technical Advisor from DMH)  
\*Participated via telephone

**Staff:**

Carol Hood  
Sandy Lyon  
Deborah Lee  
Filomena Yeroshek  
Sherri Gauger  
Kevin Hoffman  
Aaron Carruthers  
Ann Collentine

**Other Attendees:**

Stephanie Welch  
Stacie Hiramoto  
Lin Benjamin  
Gwendolyn Wilson  
Will Rhett-Mariscal

**Welcome/Introductions**

Commissioner Van Horn convened the meeting at approximately 2:00 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 it was very full.

**Review and Approve Prior Meeting Minutes**

The minutes were approved as written.

**Update Evaluation Activities**

Commissioner Van Horn introduced Tab 2 which included a briefing of evaluation efforts. Sandy Lyon provided the brief overview of evaluation activities that are current and future activities to come.

- Highlights of the briefing:
  - Phase 2 Evaluation first deliverable is due on 5/1/11 to be a summary and synthesis of existing evaluations on consumer outcomes for FSPs.
  - Phase 3 Evaluation first deliverable is due on 9/30/11
  - UCD Deliverables are to report disparities in access to services

## **Discussion and Input on Draft Evaluation Framework**

Commissioner Van Horn introduced Tab 3 and Carol Hood facilitated the discussion.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - The draft evaluation framework builds on the vision described in the accountability paper adopted by the Commission in November 2010.
  - The evaluation framework is intended to be a broad policy to provide clear direction to help the MHSOAC make evaluation-related decisions.
  - The framework the committee considered was based on the CDC evaluation framework for the scope of what to include.
  - It was recommended that the framework address who it is for to be clear of the users and its uses of the associated data
  - It was advised that the \$1ML available funding for FY 2011-12 for evaluation efforts would be more efficiently used if the context of the framework was structured similar to the CDC framework sample.
  - A recommendation was made that an understanding of what to measure and how to interpret and analyze the data is needed to know how to evaluate it.
  - The committee did not come to consensus on the framework and noted the following points that were not in agreement.
    - Who will be the audience for the framework
    - Should part of the GAO framework be used
    - How the realignment plan will impact the framework
    - Roles and responsibilities
    - The purpose of the framework and the context of MHSA in an integrated system

Commissioner Van Horn thanked staff for the presentation and thanked all committee participants for their comments. There was not consensus from the committee on the next steps and the Chair commented their will be future discussion on this topic.

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

## **Preliminary Discussion on Future Evaluation Priorities**

Commissioner Van Horn introduced Tab 4 which included a discussion of evaluation priorities.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - There is lack of clarity and agreement of what should be priorities to effect policies and decisions made at the statewide, county, program and client level.
  - It was noted that the public wants to know about the outcomes and that is an important audience to be considered as a priority in the evaluation.
  - It was recommended to use some of the funding for evaluation to ensure quality data that is accurate, efficient, and useable and for a workgroup comprised of clients and or family members, and underserved communities to determine deliverables that will lead to meaningful reports.

- The Evaluation Committee approved the following motion: The Evaluation Committee will form a workgroup that includes evaluation experts, clients, family members, and representatives from underserved communities to perform the following task and report back to the Evaluation Committee at its next meeting: Develop a set of deliverables for a contract to be funded with part of the \$1M which will lead to accurate and reliable data and thus allow meaningful reports to be generated.

Commissioner Van Horn thanked staff and all committee participants for their input. He commented that there will be more discussion of priorities for the next meeting.

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

### **Discuss UCD Deliverable of CHIS Analysis and Next Steps**

Commissioner Van Horn introduced Tab 5 and Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola presented an overview of the deliverable related to the CHIS analysis provided by UCD for the committee to discuss next steps.

- Highlights of the discussion:
  - The 2007 CHIS study of mental health needs of over 50,000 adults is to measure mental health needs and functioning using population and clinical data.
  - A recommendation was made to extend the survey to children and adolescents.
  - It was noted that given the MHSA investment in adding mental health questions to the CHIS, improvement to the questions to ensure the information from CHIS could be a useful tool.
  - It was recommended the Evaluation Committee should vet the recommendations in the report and a logical next step would be to assess and address the limitations in the study of what questions can be answered and those that can't.
  - A suggestion was made that guidance is needed regarding the unmet need and the key follow-up questions so these broad issues can be addressed as a priority for the MHSOAC.
  - It was advised that a small group and staff to get access to the data and do an analysis on it for expansion to be able to interpret it more broadly.
- Public comment was allowed and incorporated in with the committee member discussion.

### **Preliminary Discussion on Workgroup for County Reporting and Data Requirements**

Commissioner Van Horn commented this item would not be discussed and time did not permit a discussion.

### **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.