



**Evaluation Committee Meeting Minutes  
December 2, 2014  
1:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
1325 J Street, Suite 1700  
MHSOAC Board Room  
Sacramento, CA 95814**

**Committee Members:**

**Staff:**

**Other Attendees:**

Victor Carrion, Vice Chair Viviana Criado Linda Dickerson Debbie Innes-Gomberg* Davis Ja* Steve Leoni Margaret Walkover* Joshua Morgan Dave Pilon* Saumitra SenGupta Rusty Selix* Karen Stockton Steve Leoni	Renay Bradley Keith Erselius Kevin Hoffman Carrie Masten Sheridan Merritt Ashley Mills Filomena Yeroshek	Paul Keith* Dana Stein (Tri-Cities)* Patricia Wentzel Raja Mitry*
--	--	--

\*Participation by phone

Committee members absent: Stephanie Oprendeck, Sergio Aguilar-Gaxiola, Stephanie Welch, Karen Stockton, Saumitra SanGupta, Lynn Thull

**Welcome/Introductions**

The meeting was called to order and everyone in the room and over the phone introduced him or herself. Several representatives from stakeholder groups and counties around the state attended the Evaluation Committee meeting.

**1. Review and Approve Minutes from October 7, 2014 Evaluation Committee Meeting**

The Evaluation Committee (Committee) took a moment to review the minutes; Dave Pilon moved for the minutes to be approved; Davis Ja seconded. Minutes approved unanimously (no abstentions).

**2. For Discussion: Provide Input on MHSOAC Evaluation Master Plan Study 5: Effectiveness of MHSA-Funded Evidence-Based Practices (EPB's) for Children and Families**

Carrie Masten, MHSOAC Staff, gave a brief background on the project as outlined in the Evaluation Master Plan, and discussed options for how to focus the project. The Committee was asked to provide recommendations for how to most meaningfully focus the project's scope of work. Ideas raised include the following:

- Focus on obtaining an understanding of basic information about Counties' EBP's, such as the prevalence and impact, quality of care, and degree of fidelity to original EBP models.
- In addition, counties' innovations and adaptations of EBP's could be examined (e.g., cases where EBP models have been altered to be more culturally-appropriate to a specific community or demographic group). When would it be more appropriate to do an innovation project versus an EBP?
- Question raised included how to explore issues related to fidelity. Are programs with good outcomes being implemented with fidelity? Are there variations in outcomes based on fidelity practices? Could fidelity standards be built/developed? What environments make fidelity successful? What should/could be done when there is no standard way to establish fidelity? Fidelity issues apply and relate to the cost of implementing EBP.
- A potential focus on cost effectiveness of EBP's was also explored. What are the costs to do training, evaluation, fidelity monitoring, versus program implementation? What information is needed to do a cost benefit analysis of EBPs? There should be a balance between costs and client outcomes.

**Public Comment:**

Patricia Wentzel

**3. For Information & Discussion: Use of MHSOAC Evaluation Results for Quality Improvement, Communication, and Other Purposes - What Was Accomplished in 2014**

Dr. Renay Bradley gave a brief overview of the ways in which the MHSOAC has been actively trying to make evaluation results more useful toward helping the Commission achieve various goals (e.g., communication of the impact of the MHSA and quality improvement). The committee was asked for feedback on products that have been produced based on evaluation results (e.g., fact sheets; access database) and what can be done to strengthen them.

The group expressed a desire for detailed information that could be included in accessible formats tailored to a variety of audiences.

**Public Comment:**

There was no public comment on this item.

**4. For Discussion: Discuss Results of the Resource Development Associates (RDA) Community Program Planning Evaluation and Consider Ideas for Dissemination and Policy Implications**

Ashley Mills provided a brief background on the recently completed evaluation of the Community Program Planning (CPP) Process, and asked the Committee to consider

potential policy recommendations and ideas for disseminating the findings. The group considered the current evaluation and then began to discuss ideas for future efforts.

There was some disagreement about the quality and utility of the final report's findings and recommendations. One Committee Member found the recommendations helpful while another Committee Member questioned the evaluation methods (heavily qualitative and based on subjective experience) and recommended that more work was needed prior to wide dissemination of the findings.

It was further suggested that the Committee review existing CPP process regulations and discuss possible recommended changes that the Commission could adopt and recommend to the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS), who is responsible for these regulations.

The Committee discussed the importance of knowing how much counties are allocating towards their CPP processes, demonstrating transparency in the CPP process (how stakeholders are being engaged and the extent to which their participation is influencing planning decisions), and ultimately being able to connect engagement of stakeholders with improvement in services and outcomes.

**Public Comment:**

There was no public comment on this item.

**5. General Public Comment**

There was no public comment given.

**Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 3:55 PM