



Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes

Date: Tuesday, February 17, 2105 Time: 12:30pm-3:30pm

**1325 J Street, Suite 1700, Sacramento, CA 95814
Darrell Steinberg Conference Room**

Committee Members:	Staff:	Other Attendees:
Paul Keith, Co-Vice Chair*	Renay Bradley	Kate Cordell
Larry Poaster, Co-Vice Chair*	Angela Brand	Thomas Weitzel
Rocco Cheng	Keith Erselius	Lonnie Snowden
Viviana Criado	Carrie Masten	Mike Geiss
Linda Dickerson	Sheridan Merritt	Raja Mitry
Tony Hobson	Ashley Mills	Rob Engel
Davis Ja	Filomena Yeroshek	Pete LaFollette
Steve Leoni		
Belinda Lyons-Newman		
Joshua Morgan		
Dave Pilon*		
Diane Prentiss		
Rusty Selix		
Saumitra SenGupta*		
Lynn Thull		
Jennifer Walker		
Margaret Walkover		

*Participation by phone

Committee members absent: Richard Van Horn, Ruben Cantu

Welcome/Introductions

After a brief technical delay with the phone system, the meeting was moved to the MHSOAC Executive Conference Room. Commissioner Paul Keith, Co-Vice Chair, called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. Introductions were provided by all present in the room as well as on the phone.

Agenda Item 1: Adoption of the December 2, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Filomena Yeroshek, MHSOAC Chief Counsel, reviewed new voting procedures as directed by the Bagley Keene Act. As of January 1, 2015, for all action items at meetings of committees, the law now requires a record of the vote or abstention of each member present. All meeting minutes must include each committee member's name under the appropriate vote category (i.e., yes, no, abstention).

The Evaluation Committee (Committee) took a moment to review the minutes; Davis Ja motioned for the minutes to be approved; Viviana Criado seconded. Only returning committee members were eligible to vote on motion.

Vote recorded as follows:

- Approve: Viviana Criado, Linda Dickerson, Davis Ja, Joshua Morgan, Rusty Selix, Saumitra SenGupta.
- Oppose: None
- Abstain: Lynn Thull (she was not present at previous meeting)

Agenda Item 2: Review of the Commission Adopted 2015 Evaluation Committee Charter

Renay Bradley, MHSOAC Director of Research and Evaluation, presented the new 2015 Evaluation Committee Charter. The Charter was developed from the MHSOAC Work Plan, which was approved by the Commission in late 2014. The Charter was then approved by the Commission at the January 2015 Commission meeting. This document serves to direct the activities of the Committee for the 2015 calendar year.

Several Committee members expressed their desire to review the charter and make suggestions regarding content in the future.

Agenda Item 3: Review of Evaluation Master Plan and Current Status of Evaluation Implementation Efforts

Renay Bradley provided a brief overview of the MHSOAC Evaluation Master Plan and the complementary Implementation Plan; these Plans were highlighted as reference documents that guide the Commission's statutory evaluation efforts. The original Master Plan outlines 20-30 priority activities to be completed over a 5 year span. Utilizing a prioritization process originally described in the Master Plan and revised in 2014, the Evaluation Committee is instrumental in helping to guide the Commission's evaluation activities. The group was also briefed on the MHSOAC Evaluation Performance Dashboard, a document that outlines all current and forthcoming evaluation activities that is updated regularly and provided in each Commission meeting packet. The Dashboard provides a brief description on all evaluation projects and contracts, including information on deliverables, contract amounts, and contractors.

Agenda Item 4: Overview of Current and Upcoming Evaluation Projects and Opportunities for Evaluation Committee Member Involvement

Renay Bradley reviewed the current and upcoming opportunities for Evaluation Committee members to join workgroups. Current workgroups include:

- Data Strengthening
- Early Psychosis
- Recovery Oriented Programs Evaluation (ROPE)
- Evaluation of Innovative Program Evaluations

Forthcoming workgroups include:

- Evaluation of Assisted Outpatient Treatment (AOT)/ "Laura's Law"

- Screening for Substance Use Disorder (SUD)
- Evaluation of Effectiveness of MHSA Programs for Children, Youth, and Families
- Effectiveness of Peer/Consumer Led/Run Services

Staff will be sending an email to the group to follow up on opportunities to be involved in workgroups. Additionally, existing members who wish to opt out of current participation in groups will have the opportunity to do so.

Renay noted that, in some cases, MHSOAC evaluation projects have opportunities for stakeholders to be involved via evaluation advisory groups. In many cases, evaluation committee members have been invited to serve on those advisory groups, which are run by project leads or contractors and meet regularly for the duration of a project. On the contrary, evaluation committee workgroups typically meet much less (e.g., once at the start of a project to assist with development of the scope of work; annually to provide input on how to prioritize activities), are subject to open meeting rules, and are run by MHSOAC staff. Workgroup members have sometimes been referred to project leads/contractors as potential advisory group members. MHSOAC staff will make an effort to update committee members on opportunities for participation in both work groups and advisory groups. Evaluation advisory group members may also be asked to report back to the Committee on project progress.

Agenda Item 5: Update on the Full Service Partnership (FSP) Classification Project

During the meeting, it was discovered that this agenda item was not properly titled within the meeting agenda. It was not focused on the FSO classification project at all. Kate Cordell, Managing Director, Mental Health Data Alliance (MHDATA) presented to the Committee her findings on Children's Full Service Partnerships in California with the goal of obtaining suggestions on how to focus her two research briefs (including which specific target audiences the information may be especially pertinent to). Ms. Cordell explained that she assessed three primary research questions that could be the focus of the briefs:

- What is the availability of Children's FSP Programs?
- Are they serving unserved and underserved communities?
- As a result, has there been a reduction in Mental Health Emergency Services?

Ms. Cordell reviewed the statistical information and research that she had compiled to address these questions. Some in the Committee remarked that they felt that some of the information was outdated or inaccurate and asked for further clarification on where she obtained information and why it was utilized in the report. Due to the time and nature of her presentation, the group agreed to postpone discussion of the relevancy of presented research and focus instead on the briefs to be created for the Commission. The following groups were recommended as potential audiences of interest and insight to this area: providers, lawyers, and those providing assessments to children to discern what families are getting out of the services and how they having an impact.

Public Comment

There was no public comment provided for this agenda item.

Agenda Item 6: Development of Strategies for Strengthening the Annual Revenue and Expenditure Reports (ARER) for Evaluation Purposes

Renay Bradley provided background information that the MHSOAC is looking at ways to strengthen data collection efforts for tracking fiscal responsibility as mandated by the MHSA. Based on the studies conducted by UCLA (as part of a previous evaluation contract deliverable), it was noted that there are large amounts of MHSA funds that have been dispersed to counties but could not readily be accounted for by contractors or the Department of Health Care Services, who followed up on what the contractors did and later corroborated the findings. This inability to fully account for all MHSA expenditures highlighted the need to explore strategies and ideas for data collection that could potentially strengthen fiscal reporting done via the ARER. It was stated that this is also an area of interest/focus of the MHSOAC Financial Oversight Committee and would be further discussed at their next meeting as well.

The group highlighted the need to better consider and understand our needs for various data (e.g., research questions) before a meaningful discussion could be had surrounding how to strengthen the ARER specifically. The group discussed challenges as well as needs for data related to fiscal reporting, including:

- Determining what data is reliable
- Developing an understanding of programs – what are counties doing
- How money is being spent
- Looking at how to show distribution of funds when county money and MHSA money is integrated and often leveraged
- Discussing what parameters would make for consistent reports
- How to articulate questions and concerns as raised by the Little Hoover Commission report.

The group also discussed comparing the California model of fiscal data collection to what is being done and required nationally. Federal government requirements can be used for comparison and possible development of standards around that framework. It was noted that the counties may not find relevance or value in the ARER as an obligatory tool; there is a need to identify what the State needs, as well as county needs, so that a system can be developed that meets both State and county needs. The group discussed additional thoughts on how to frame fiscal data needs, including:

- What research question is being addressed?
- What needs to be measured in order to address the research question(s)?
- What is the specific role of the MHSOAC as it pertains to the financial piece?
- Beyond compliance, is the proper fiscal data being collected?

The group also discussed the importance of strengthening data collection and making this a strong priority of the Committee. Staff agreed to share at the next Committee meeting an

overview of efforts currently underway to improve data collection and reporting, and how fiscal data can be incorporated into those efforts.

Public Comment

There was no public comment provided for this agenda item.

General Public Comment

Public comment was made to request a more inclusive stakeholder process.

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 3:55pm.