



WELLNESS • RECOVERY • RESILIENCE

State of California

MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES OVERSIGHT AND ACCOUNTABILITY COMMISSION

Minutes of Teleconference
January 10, 2013

Members Participating

Richard Van Horn, Chairman
David Pating, M.D., Vice Chairman

Senator Lou Correa
Sheriff William Brown
Victor Carrion, M.D.
Ralph Nelson, Jr., M.D.
Larry Poaster, Ph. D
Andrew Poat
Tina Wooton

Members Absent

None

Staff Present

Sherri Gauger, Executive Director
Aaron Carruthers, Chief Deputy Executive Director
Filomena Yeroshek, Chief Counsel
Kevin Hoffman, Deputy Director
Renay Bradley, Research and Evaluation Chief
Norma Pate, Administrative Chief
Jose Oseguera, Committee Operations Chief
Kristal Carter, Staff Services Analyst

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL

Chair Van Horn called the meeting to order at 9:09 am and welcomed everyone. Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability (MHSOAC) Staff Kristal Carter called the roll and confirmed a quorum.

2. CONSIDER RECOMMENDATION TO AWARD CONTRACT IN RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR AN EVALUATION OF THE COMMUNITY PLANNING PROCESS (CPP) AND TO AUTHORIZE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO THE CONTRACT

Renay Bradley, Ph.D., Chief of Research and Evaluation, MHSOAC, presented an overview of the Request for Proposal (RFP) for an Evaluation of the Community Planning Process (CPP) that was released to the public on October 31, 2012. The MHSOAC used the competitive bidding process to select a contractor for the CPP Evaluation and the deadline to submit RFP proposals was December 14, 2012. Dr. Bradley stated that the scoring process was completed and that the MHSOAC needed to consider approving the Intent – to Award for the CPP Evaluation contract.

Dr. Bradley began by stating that MHSOAC has a statutory role to evaluate California's community-based mental health system, as defined in the Welfare and Institutions Code sections (WIC) 5845(a) and 5845(d)(12). In November 2010, the Commission adopted the Accountability through Evaluative Efforts policy paper in which it asserts the role and commitment of MHSOAC and its approach of

unremitting evaluation and intent to learn from and build upon each progressive evaluation with a focus on quality improvement. This paper is on the MHSOAC website: www.mhsoac.ca.gov

The objective of CPP Evaluation is to use participatory research to evaluate the impact and effectiveness of CPP for quality improvement. A CPP process must be in place in each county that aims to continuously engage the community and ensure that community members and groups have an opportunity to participate in MHSA efforts and provide feedback on MHSA decisions. Evaluators will be required to collaborate with a selected group of stakeholders, funded through a separate Client Stakeholder Contract.

Dr. Bradley reviewed the scope of work stating that the project will begin with the development of a survey or data collection method that will capture information on, and stakeholder perceptions of, the current CPP. Client Contractors will use the data collected to develop a current inventory and conceivably capture other constructs defined via stakeholder perceptions, including CPP impact. The end goal of this research is to improve upon and identify positive and a useful CPP that can be shared and taught to others.

Dr. Bradley stated that the RFP review process is consistent with the California Department of General Services procedures and regulatory requirements. The proposals were scored based on combination and experience, and qualification and cost. The decision was not based on the lowest bid; rather it was based on the best value.

A Review Panel comprised of MHSOAC staff, representatives from the Office of Health Equity, the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), and the California Mental Health Planning Council (CMHPC), convened to assess the proposals and the final selection was determined based on the highest overall point score.

Bidders not selected through the scoring process may protest the award within five (5) working days, during which a Notice of Intent to Award will be publicly posted. The protestor must prove the scoring was erroneous, and as a consequence they would have been awarded the contract had MHSOAC correctly applied the prescribed rating standards and/or correctly followed the RFP scoring methods. The decision will then go to MHSOAC Executive Director Sherri Gauger and, as specified in the RFP, the decision will be final. After the protest period, MHSOAC will negotiate and implement the contract with the selected bidder, after which the contractor begins the work.

Dr. Bradley stated that the contract recommendation to the Commission is that the contract be awarded to the Resource Development Association (RDA) because it received the highest score.

3. COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Commissioner Poat asked why this presentation is being conducted on Teleconference. Chair Van Horn answered that the Commission needs to enter into the contract as soon as possible and therefore chose to conduct this meeting at the earliest opportunity.

Commissioner Nelson inquired as to who RDA is. Dr. Bradley stated that Resource Development Associates, RDA is a full-service consulting firm founded in 1984. According to RDA's bid, their aim is to improve services and outcomes for mental health agencies, school districts, youth services, and community-based organizations. In each project, RDA collects and analyzes quantitative and qualitative data, and conducts a systems-level analysis. RDA strengthens effective, accountable, collaborative service delivery systems, and seeks to bring stakeholders together to work toward realizing a collective vision of improvements in services and supports for the people they serve.

Commissioner Poaster inquired if the Commission had conducted a conflict of interest check. Chief Counsel Filomena Yeroshek answered affirmatively and stated that the Commission completed the check upon receipt of the Intent to Bid and found no conflicts of interest.

Commissioner Carrion asked what the timeline of the deliverables is. Dr. Bradley answered that the timeline is one year.

Commissioner Poat asked who on the Commission, or staff, the champion is. Vice Chair Pating answered the Chair of Evaluation.

Commissioner Poaster stated that Dr. Bennett, the owner of RDA, is well known. He asked if the overall goal is an evaluation of impact and effectiveness of CPP, and if the evaluation will define "effectiveness". Dr. Bradley stated that the outcomes will encompass these answers.

Commissioner Wooton advocated for stakeholders to be involved.

Commissioner Poat stated that he would prefer to conduct this type of business in person, to which Chair Van Horn stated that he would have to look at meeting processes and make a decision.

4. PUBLIC COMMENT

Vickie Mendoza, United Advocates for Children and Families (UACF), Institute for Family and Youth Leadership, opined that RDA is an intelligent choice.

ACTION: *Commissioner Poaster made a motion, seconded by Vice Chair Pating to:*

1. *Authorize the Executive Director to issue a "Notice of Intent to Award Contract" to Resource Development Associates (RDA).*
2. *Establish January 17, 2013 as the deadline for unsuccessful bidders to file an "Intent to Protest" consistent with the five working day standard set forth in the Request for Proposals.*
3. *Direct the Executive Director to notify the Commission Chair and Vice Chair of any protests within two working days of the filing.*
4. *Authorize the Executive Director to adjudicate protests consistent with the procedure provided in the Request for Proposals.*
5. *Authorize the Executive Director to execute the contract upon expiration of the protest period or consideration of protests, whichever comes first.*
 - *Motion carried, 7 "yes" 0 "no" and 2 abstentions.*

5. CONSIDER RECOMMENDATION TO AWARD CONTRACT IN RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS FOR CLIENT STAKEHOLDER SERVICES AND TO AUTHORIZE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR TO ENTER INTO THE CONTRACT

Cynthia Burt, Staff Mental Health Specialist, MHSOAC, presented an overview of the Request for Proposal (RFP) for the Client Stakeholder that was released October 31, 2012. The MHSOAC used the competitive bidding process to select a contractor for Client Stakeholders and the deadline to submit RFP proposals was December 14, 2012. Ms. Burt stated that the scoring process was completed and that the MHSOAC needed to consider approving the Intent-to-Award for the Client Stakeholder contract.

Ms Burt explained that the Client Stakeholder contract is one of four stakeholder contracts that was assigned by the Budget Act to the Commission with the elimination of the Department of Mental Health (DMH).

Ms. Burt reviewed the scope of work, stating that in collaboration with the CPP contractor, the contract begins with creating a data collection method that will capture information on, and stakeholder perceptions of, current CPP. Using these methods, Client Contractor will utilize the data to develop an inventory. The collaborators will submit their respective reports and the Client Stakeholder contractor will pool resources with the CPP contractor to develop curriculum to assist with training stakeholder communities on effective CPP. Subsequently, a summary of Training and Technical Assistance implementation activities, the establishment and implantation of an Expert Pool, and a directive to staff MHSA and MHSOAC meetings will be required.

Ms. Burt stated that a robust stakeholder process is critical to the success of the Mental Health Services Act (MHSA). Assembly Bill (AB) 1467, which amended the MHSA reinforces this to strengthen the stakeholder perspective at the state and local level to strengthen the stakeholder perspective at the local level.

The RFP review, scoring, notice, and bidder protest processes reflect those used in the CPP Evaluation contract. After the protest period of five (5) working days expires without a protest, the MHSOAC will negotiate and implement the contract with the selected bidder, after which the contractor will begin the work.

Ms. Burt stated that the bid was viewed on Bidsync 71 times and downloaded 21 times, five Letters of Intent were received, and two proposals were submitted. Peers Envisioning and Engaging in Recovery Services (PEERS) received the highest score and is therefore the recommended entity. PEERS is a consumer-run organization that endeavors to transform the mental health system into a wellness, recovery, and resiliency model. They contribute to mental health consumers through a not-for-profit commitment in eliminating mental health disparities, and collaborate with consumers, their families, mental health providers, and the community.

6. COMMISSIONER DISCUSSION

Chair Van Horn stated that the Network held the prior Client Stakeholder contract, but it was terminated by DMH and that is the reason the Commission competitively bid this contract.

Commissioner Poaster asked if there was any conflict of interest, to which Chief Counsel Filomena Yeroshek answered negatively.

Commissioner Poaster asked who heads PEERS. Ms. Burt answered that Lisa Smusz is the interim Executive Director for PEERS. Ms. Smusz has 15 years of experience in the mental health field, which includes working as project manager on large-scale mental health projects such as Wellness Recovery Action Planning (WRAP). Ms. Smusz focus is reducing mental health associated stigma, providing access to underserved populations, and increasing efficiency in the mental health system of care.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Raul Sanzburg inquired if there is a plan for people to be a stakeholder and if so, who is eligible.

Lisa Smusz stated that she is now the permanent Executive Director of PEERS is a fiscal agent.

Sally Zinman stated that she is the interim Executive Director of the California Association of Mental Health Peer Run Organizations (CAMHPRO) which is a subcontractor of PEERS. All the board members of CAMHPRO are consumers.

ACTION: *Commissioner Poaster made a motion, seconded by Commissioner Poat to:*

1. *Authorize the Executive Director to issue a “Notice of Intent to Award Contract” to PEERS.*
2. *Establish January 17, 2013 as the deadline for unsuccessful bidders to file an “Intent to Protest” consistent with the five working day standard set forth in the Request for Proposals.*
3. *Direct the Executive Director to notify the Commission Chair and Vice Chair of any protests within two working days of the filing.*
4. *Authorize the Executive Director to adjudicate protests consistent with the procedure provided in the Request for Proposals.*
5. *Authorize the Executive Director to execute the contract upon expiration of the protest period or consideration of protests, whichever comes first.*

- *Motion: carried 9-0*

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 10:10 a.m.