

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES
OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION (MHSOAC)
Evaluation Committee
Conference Room 71-1203
1501 Capitol Ave., Room 71-1203
Sacramento, CA 95811
August 24, 2011
1:30 P.M. to 4:30 P.M.
DRAFT**

Committee Members Present:

Richard Van Horn, Chair
Dawn Williams
Viviana Criado
Debbie Innes-Gomberg
Tim Smith
Denise Hunt
Karyn Dresser
Steve Leoni
Rusty Selix
Stephanie Oprende
Kathleen Derby
Candace Milow*
Karen Stockton
Stephanie Welch

Staff:

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

Other Attendees:

Dan Souza
Stacie Hiramoto*
Raul Sanchez*
Diane Woods
Todd Franke*

*Participated via telephone

Welcome/Introductions

Commissioner Van Horn convened the meeting at approximately 1:35 p.m.

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

Review and Approve Prior Meeting Minutes

The minutes were approved with the following edits. A request was made to include a comment to extend the deadline regarding Participatory Research to allow sufficient time for stakeholder inclusion as an evaluation priority. In addition, it was noted to include the expansion of funding for Participatory Research as an evaluation priority.

Update on Evaluation Activities and Processes and Current Year Committee Work Plan

Staff provided the update of evaluation activities that are current and those scheduled to be completed by the end of the calendar year. The 2011 Evaluation Committee Charter Work Plan was also updated.

- Highlights of the update:
 - The Department of Mental Health (DMH) has a contract with the Regents of the California, Los Angeles (UCLA) to provide data collection and

delivery of services regarding the 2011 and 2013 California Health Information Survey (CHIS). The term of the contract is April 1, 2011 to June 30, 2013.

- The Phase 3 Evaluation was amended to revise the due date from 9/30/11 to 11/30/11 for the initial deliverables for the participatory research process to help ensure the opportunity for participants to have adequate time to participate.
- The contract with CSUS University Enterprise for data systems support deliverables will be reviewed in draft format by a work group that consists of end users to determine useability.
- The 2011 Evaluation Committee Charter activities #3, and #4 regarding work groups for the data collection and county reporting requirements and the Integrated Plan, are on hold due to the impact of AB 100. Activity #5 will be revised to include “recommendations” made from contractors for the committee to analyze instead of their “findings” for policy implications or other quality improvement strategies.

Discuss Process for Setting Evaluation Priorities

Staff led the discussion regarding the procedure to prioritize proposed recommendations regarding the use of the \$875,000 evaluation funds available for FY 2011-12 for the committee to finalize proposals in October for the Commission’s action in November. The committee considered brainstorming ideas from last year that were also presented at the June 2011 for consideration.

- Highlights of the discussion:
 - Input was received on the document developed by staff titled, “Establishing Priorities and Focusing Evaluations of the MHSOAC, July 29, 2011” to be used as a tool for priority setting based on input provided by committee members during previous committee discussions. The goal of its use is to help to get to a structure for a process to set the priorities.
 - A comment was made that if the priority setting document is to be used for future spending it should specify that it’s for an on-going plan instead of being an “interim” one.
 - It was noted that the Audience for selecting priorities should be focused at all levels and not just solely at the state level because it has to be seen as locally relevant to be meaningful.
 - A comment noted that the method proposed should include stakeholder input into the design process so the impact at the end of the evaluation enables their participation regarding recommendations delivered in the evaluation.
 - The selection of evaluation priorities should consider what is feasible to ensure resources are available because the evaluation will only be meaningful if there is a purpose for the data collected and there are next steps related to it’s utilization.
 - Input was received on the document titled, “Draft Format for Proposal for FY 2011/12 MHSOAC Evaluation” developed by staff as a format for submission of proposals of evaluation priorities to be a tool to assist staff to develop recommendations to provide to the committee in early October.

- A comment was made that the write up for the proposals should include Key Administrators recommendations
- The estimation of funding was recommended to be by ranking categories such as: 1) building on current evaluations, 2) data supports 3) infrastructure strategies, 4) special projects, 5) immediate or long term efforts, and to consider the pros and cons of each
- A recommendation was made for a staff led work group to convene to develop recommendations for prioritized proposals as options for committee consideration using the format
 - A recommendation was made to consider adolescents that are of school age as a priority based on indicators that should be reported in currently captured data. An example includes special education that is coordinated by the California Department of Education (CDE). Recommend Staff do research to determine next step strategy to link the MHSOAC and CDE's efforts.
 - A Committee member requested information regarding the funding currently allocated for Participatory Research in Phase 3. The funding in the contract with UCLA for all participatory research is \$500,000.
 - The Committee decided as a next step to convene a staff led workgroup to assist staff with the development of recommendations to prioritize proposals and funding. The staff workgroup will seek input from subject matter experts. Committee members agreed to submit proposals for the staff workgroup's consideration with the resulting recommendations developed by staff to be provided to the Committee for review before the October 26th meeting.
- Public comment was received and incorporated in with the Committee member discussion.

Discuss Recommendations from Deliverables 2A and 2C and Suggest Next Steps

Staff led the discussion regarding advisory recommendations to be presented to the Commission based on recommendations in Deliverables 2A and 2C of the Phase 2 Evaluation submitted by UCLA.

- Highlights of the discussion:
 - The quality of the data used to complete the deliverables was commented on regarding the State's reporting systems that don't currently have the capacity for counties to correct any issues once the data is sent to the State
 - A comment was made to consider getting the data directly from the counties instead of the State to ensure its accuracy for the on-going evaluation.
 - It was noted, UCLA has not obtained data yet from the State but input by stakeholders regarding data collection and reporting has identified issues that impact the reporting of priority indicators, as submitted feedback to UCLA on the Deliverable reports.
 - A recommendation was provided to consider priority evaluation funding to ensure data quality is available at the local level and statewide so the

analyses for reports that measure the impact of the MHSA on specific indicators is designed to use valid data for completion

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

Update on Proposed Legislation, SB 893

Staff led the discussion regarding updates on the proposed bill, SB 893.

- Highlights of the discussion:
 - This is a two year bill that may take some time to move and is currently not out of the Policy Committee yet.
- Public comment was received and incorporated in with the committee member discussion.

Set Preliminary Agenda Items for October 26th Meeting

The following potential topics were proposed by Committee members for future consideration by the committee.

1. Finalize evaluation priority proposals
2. Determine contract deliverables as priority recommendations
3. Learn and understand Community Engagement Principles specific to Evaluation
4. Coordination with California Department of Education (CDE) and evaluation priorities regarding CDE data reporting
5. Updates on data systems and the Department of Health Care Services oversight responsibility to manage

Next meeting

October 26, 2011 at 1:30 to 4:30 p.m.

Location to be determined.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:25 p.m.