



**Meeting Minutes
June 23, 2011
Commission Meeting via Teleconference**

**MHSOAC Conference Room
1300 17th Street, Suite 1000
Sacramento, California**

1. Call to Order

Chair Larry Poaster called the meeting to order at 9:06 a.m.

2. Roll Call

Commissioners on the call: Chair Larry Poaster, Vice Chair Richard Van Horn, Sherriff William Brown, Victor Carrion, MD, Patrick Henning, Ralph Nelson Jr., MD, David Pating, MD, Andrew Poat, and Eduardo Vega. Howard Kahn and Tina Wooton joined the teleconference meeting after roll call.

Not in attendance: Senator Lou Correa and Assemblymember Mary Hayashi.

11 members were present on the call and a quorum was established.

3. Award Contractual Agreement for Data Quality Improvements to the Data Collection Reporting System

Vice Chair Van Horn, who serves as the Chair of the Evaluation Committee, was invited by Chair Poaster to make some introductory remarks in regard to this agenda item.

Vice Chair Van Horn stated that this agenda item had come up because there were some one-time funds available in the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC) 2010/11 Fiscal Year (FY) operating budget. There has been a great deal of push for the Commission to enter into a new phase of evaluation work which would necessitate trying to improve the quality of the data. The difficulty of having timely and accurate data has been an ongoing problem and the Evaluation Committee has been desirous of resolving this issue. There had been some discussion of using a portion of the \$1 million reserved for evaluation to do this; however, the discovery of the unspent operating budget funds for FY 2010/11 makes drawing money away from the \$1 million unnecessary. In order to utilize these funds a contract must be in place, voted on, and signed by June 30, 2011. This short timeframe resulted in a very truncated trip through the Evaluation Committee and although the Committee did not vote on this item, almost all of the comments from Committee members were highly favorable.

Aaron Carruthers, Chief Deputy Executive Director, gave an overview of the contractual agreement for data quality improvements to support the Department of Mental Health's (DMH) Data Collection and Reporting (DCR) System. Highlights are below.

- There are one-time year-end dollars available in the MHSOAC operating budget because of salary savings, implementing the travel freeze, and disencumbering funds that were part of a plan review contract, that was no longer necessary once the plan review function was removed from the MHSOAC.
- This contract is critical to ensure data quality improvements and will need to be executed by June 30, 2011 to encumber the funds from FY 2010/11.
- DCR collects counties' client information and outcomes on Full Service Partnership (FSP) programs.
- Challenges with the DCR are that regular reported feedback is not available to the Counties and Counties are not provided with technical assistance to determine if there are problems with their reported data.
- In order for the Commission's Evaluation Committee to ensure valid evaluations and reports, it is imperative that the Counties' overall client data and outcomes are accurate and reliable.
- The Data Quality Workgroup (Workgroup) was established by the Evaluation Committee to develop draft deliverables and provide recommendations for data quality improvements.
- The Workgroup recommended programming changes to the DCR to allow easier submission and data correction. These recommendations are Information Technology (IT) specific fixes that DMH will complete by September 2011. The Workgroup also recommended increasing user supports, which is what is included in the proposed contract with California State University, Sacramento (CSUS).
- MHSOAC requested proposals from University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and CSUS. CSUS submitted a proposal that was less costly, had more deliverables, and was timelier with the deliverables.
- The term of the proposed contract with CSUS is from June 2011 to June 2012 for a total of \$360,232.00 to provide ten deliverables. The deliverables include developing a DCR Data Dictionary and User Manual, developing and providing training on the DCR system and statistical analysis, creating e-Training materials, and providing Microsoft Access and Excel report templates to assist Counties in generating reports.

Commissioner Henning asked how much money was left in the MHSOAC budget. Sherri Gauger, Executive Director, responded that these are one-time funds that are available from the MHSOAC's operating budget due to the hiring freeze and five vacant staff positions and thus the Commission is able to cover the cost of the proposed contract.

Commissioner Henning also wanted to know why we only reached out to UCLA and CSUS. He wanted to know if this was due to an expertise situation. Filomena Yeroshek, MHSOAC Chief Counsel, responded that the Workgroup met on June 1, 2011 and made its recommendation that same day. The MHSOAC has to encumber the funds and sign the contract before the end of June 2011. As such, the MHSOAC reached out to these two groups because of their expertise and the timing requirement.

Commissioner Poat asked whether there were any recommendations proposed by the Workgroup that were not included in the proposed contract. Aaron Carruthers responded that the Workgroup developed a series of long-term and short-term recommendations and the proposed contract meets the Workgroup's recommendations for immediate short-term goals.

Commissioner Poat, in a follow-up question, wanted to know how the long-term goals will be examined and would they be resolved by a larger evaluation contract or were they part of an unfunded next step? Vice Chair Van Horn responded that those goals would be addressed through the Evaluation Committee's normal process. Commissioner Pating added that these long-term issues do not go away and they will be incorporated into the next level of evaluation contracts. The Evaluation Committee is currently looking at how to spend another \$875,000.00 that is set aside for the next step of evaluation.

Commissioner Pating went on to note that this set of recommendations came from questions raised by the Evaluation Committee concerning why the MHSOAC is unable to get reports out now when data has been entered for years. Initially it looked as though this would be a data cleaning issue as well as a political matter of getting people to buy into the data system. When the technical experts met, it turned out to be a technical problem that should be simple to fix. There was almost uniform agreement from the technical experts, the Counties, and DMH that the problems with the DCR system were IT related and not motivational or political.

Commissioner Poat asked if this was an attempt to improve our existing data system with data that we all anticipate to be of continuing value and that will likely be incorporated into the larger evaluation information that we are going to be collecting as a result of the UCLA study. Commissioner Pating responded that this data from the Full Service Partnerships (FSPs) is like the data the Commission saw in the prior UCLA report including the number of people that are housed, the number that are incarcerated. Given how effective the UCLA data was, we need to maintain and upkeep that as a core component of our data set. It is a very easy fix for the DCR system.

Commissioner Poat wanted to confirm that this information is going to be of continuing value once the UCLA study is completed.

Chair Poaster confirmed that the DCR system fix must be done to set the stage for the long-term fixes.

Commissioner Poat stated that another way to look at it was that there is no need to wait to fix something that we know we are going to need long-term.

Commissioner Vega stated that it sounds like the consumer of this contract is the Counties. He wanted to know how soon the Commission can expect the implementation of this to provide new and better information and how CSUS will work with UCLA throughout the term of the contract. Vice Chair Van Horn responded that CSUS will have a basic collaborative relationship with UCLA. The information from this contract assists Counties in getting information back out and assists the FSPs in that the Counties will now have information to share with them.

Chair Poaster added that the beneficiary of the DCR system fix will be the MHSOAC itself in terms of having confidence in the data.

Public Comment

- Ms. Delphine Brody, Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) Public and Policy Director at the California Network of Mental Health Clients (CNMHC), stated that data collection and data quality is valuable to the current statewide evaluation of the MHSA and the DCR and she did not believe there would be any disagreement from mental health clients about that. She did feel that the process was troubling because there was no vote from the Evaluation Committee prior to the vote from the Commission. She stated that it would have been better to start this process earlier and to have had a full participatory process instead of a very rushed one. More importantly, it is of great importance and value to look at the larger policy issues that are heavily implicated in what data is being collected for which programs. If we are simply looking at data collected for one set of programs, FSPs, we are ignoring many other types of data that mental health clients and unserved/underserved communities have been urging the Commission to look at for quite some time. This includes the types of access to various MHSA programs outside of FSPs, who is being served by the system in a voluntary manner vs. who is being involuntarily treated, and disaggregating data on populations and gathering new data on populations that are historically unserved/underserved such as people of middle-eastern descent, people of south-asian descent, and people who are lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and/or questioning. All of this needs to happen. She hoped that other monies in the pot of one-time year-end funds can be allocated.
- Kathleen Derby, National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI) California, stated that she understood the necessity of valid evaluation. She was aware that this money was just recently discovered and that it was necessary to encumber these funds before the end of FY 2010/11; however, she was concerned that some of these funds were taken from the travel freeze funds. She felt that it is important to bring clients and family members and the MHSOAC together for productive purposes which are mission critical. Moving funds from the travel fund for evaluation appears to be a mixture of purposes. She felt there might be more appropriate sources to fund the DCR system fixes, such as Counties or the State. She recognized the necessity of the DCR system fixes and appreciated that the MHSOAC was being proactive, but she questioned the process and the funding allocations that are being used.

- Ms. Stacie Hiramoto, Racial and Ethnic Mental Health Disparities Coalition, stated that she shared Ms. Brody’s and Ms. Derby’s concerns. She is looking for transparency in the MHSOAC processes. She understood that this had to be done quickly, but felt if other people had been informed there could have been other uses for this money that would have been just as urgent or useful. She felt that even for the Evaluation Committee, decisions must be client and family driven. She was concerned that Counties may have not been involving consumers, family members, and people from the community in their data and understanding it and making decisions jointly.
- Mark Karmatz stated that the Peer in Crisis Programs in Los Angeles County appeared to be in limbo. Chair Poaster let Mr. Karmatz know that only comments on the proposed contract was being addressed at this time.

Motion:

- The MHSOAC approves the proposed one year contract for \$360,232.00 with University Enterprises, Inc., on behalf of the California State University Sacramento.
- The MHSOAC authorizes the Executive Director to execute the above mentioned contract.

Approved with 11 “yes”, 0 “no”, and 0 abstentions

Commissioner making motion: Van Horn

Commissioner seconding motion: Poat

Name	Yes	No	Abstain
Chair Poaster	x		
Vice Chair Van Horn	x		
Commissioner Brown	x		
Commissioner Carrion	x		
Commissioner Correa			
Commissioner Hayashi			
Commissioner Henning	x		
Commissioner Kahn	x		
Commissioner Nelson	x		
Commissioner Pating	x		
Commissioner Poat	x		
Commissioner Vega	x		
Commissioner Wooton	x		

After the vote, Ms. Brody asked Chair Poaster if general public comment would be allowed. Chair Poaster responded that because it was not noticed on the agenda, public comment could not be allowed. Commissioner Vega requested that in the future we allow general public comment during teleconference meetings if possible and Chair Poaster indicated that it would be taken into consideration.

Vice Chair Van Horn invited Mark Karmatz to send the Commission a letter about his concerns with the Peer in Crisis Programs in Los Angeles County. Chair Poaster also indicated that Mr. Karmatz' concerns could be addressed at the July MHSOAC meeting.

4. Adjournment

Chair Poaster adjourned the meeting at 9:41 a.m.