Overview

- Introductions
- MHSOAC
- UCLA/EMT
- Evaluation Framework
- Deliverables
- Orientation to Evaluation
  - CDC Framework
  - Utilization-Focused Evaluation
  - Participatory Research
Overarching Evaluation Framework

• Present the framework within which our team will:
  • Work with multiple stakeholders (e.g., clients, families, counties) and report information relevant to different categories of users
  • Map information needs in complex service systems providing continuous services
  • Work with integrated data collection systems and conduct analysis that supports continuous quality improvement
  • Partner with key stakeholders to develop recommendations for a performance monitoring system with respect to processes, outcomes and impacts

Objectives of Statewide MHSA Evaluation Contract - Phase II

• Deliverable #1
  • Report of Activities and Costs of Local MHSA Funds
• Deliverable #2
  • Reports on Prioritized Indicators
• Deliverable #3
  • Summary and Synthesis of Existing Evaluations on CSS and PEI
• Deliverable #4
  • Final Report
Objectives of Statewide MHSA Evaluation Contract - Phase III

- **Deliverable #1**
  - FSP Cost-Offset and Benefit Reports
- **Deliverable #2**
  - Reports on General System Development Impact on Individual and System (all age groups)
  - Reports on Consumer, Family and Caregiver Involvement in MHSA and its Impact on Client Outcomes
  - Participatory Research – significant aspect of Phase III, but consistent with the UCLA/EMT utilization-focused evaluation approach to Phases II and III
- **Deliverable #3**
  - Final Report and Recommendations on Next Steps for Evaluation

UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities (CHCFC)

- Is a multidisciplinary research, policy and training institute at UCLA with faculty from the UCLA Schools of Medicine, Public Health, and Public Affairs.
- The mission of the UCLA CHCFC is to promote children’s and families lifelong health, mental health, development and well-being by creating and translating innovative ideas and research into optimal environments, systems and policies.
Evaluation • Management • Training (EMT)

• EMT’s Mission:
  • To promote and facilitate the use of relevant information to improve social policy and enhance the resolution of social problems
  • Evaluated over 50 CBO recovery programs for adults
    • All programs serving people of color
  • Two decades of evaluation partnership with Tribal communities
    • e.g., Nez Perce, several Alaska Native Tribes.
  • Currently partnering with ICF on national Native Aspirations effort

Statewide MHSA Evaluation Contracts – Launch Dates

• Phase II
  • Contract with MHSOAC executed on 2/7
  • Kick off meeting held 1/27
    • MHSOAC Evaluation Committee Chair also joined the meeting
• Phase III
  • Kick off meeting scheduled 3/30
Our Orientation to Evaluation and the Statewide MHSA Evaluation

- Utilization-focused (Patton, 2008)
  - Focus on producing information which is useful for decision makers and other key stakeholders
  - End-users of evaluation data are integrally involved in development and implementation of the evaluation
- Data collected and feedback delivered must be:
  - Meaningful
  - Useful
  - Timely

Evaluation Framework

http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/rr4811a1.htm (36 of 52) 2/13/2007
Statewide Evaluation Phases

Starting from the beginning..... But we are dropping in after the horse has left the barn!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Logical Sequence of Activities</th>
<th>First Deliverable Starts with Step 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Engage stakeholders</td>
<td>4. Gather credible evidence (existing reports about CSS and PEI outcomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Describe the program</td>
<td>5. Justify conclusions (write a summary report about CSS and PEI outcomes)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Focus the evaluation design</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Gather credible evidence</td>
<td>CSS (FSP) Report Due May 1, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Justify conclusions</td>
<td>PEI Report Due August 31, 2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ensure use and share lessons learned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

But what about engaging stakeholders?

Stakeholder Engagement Principles:

- Stakeholder groups will generally have time to review and provide feedback
- All recommendations will be considered
- Because we will be receiving feedback from different stakeholder groups and recommendations may vary, we will make the final call when conflicting recommendations for revisions are made
Engaging Stakeholders

**Examples** (there will be many more!)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Stakeholder Group</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advisory Board, Regional Coordinators</td>
<td>Conceptual Framework</td>
<td>Review, Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Client and family members**</td>
<td>Draft reports including PEI and FSP</td>
<td>Review, Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMHDA IDEA Committee, Evaluation Experts (e.g., Brian Yates, Steve Hahn-Smith, UCSD Team Members, San Francisco County Team)</td>
<td>Recommended Outcomes (backed by data available and accessible in existing data sources) for FSP Cost-Offset and Benefit Analysis</td>
<td>Review, Feedback</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Still need to identify optimum process for identifying and collaborating with existing stakeholder groups**

Evaluation Framework

- **Building Collaboration**
  - Identify and Engage Key Stakeholder Groups
    - Individuals who are or have been involved with the public mental health system, their families, and caregivers
    - County mental health management
    - County service providers
    - Advisory Board
Participatory Research

• Example:
  • Priority Indicators
    • Proposing variables from existing measures that can be compiled to create measures
    • Proposing creation of system-level measures through coding of existing reports augmented with key stakeholder interview data (e.g., web survey of select group of county mental health staff)
      • Draft matrices will be vetted through existing key stakeholder groups for review and feedback
      • Draft web survey will be vetted through existing key stakeholder groups for review and feedback

Participatory Process

• Example:
  • Logic Model
    • Map information needs in complex system
      • Part of “Defining the Program” Process
      • Overarching conceptual framework and related evaluation logic models graphically depicting each component of the study, instruments, data sources
      • Participatory research process will involve bringing drafts to existing stakeholder groups for review and feedback
What to expect... in a nutshell

- We will use existing data whenever and wherever possible
  - A lot of data has been collected – we have been tasked with analyzing it across the counties and regions
- When we create new measures, we will do so out of existing data whenever and wherever possible
- We understand that each county has unique features and characteristics, and that these features are not reflected in cross-site reports linked to client impact
  - This suggests that there may be a need to gather additional system-level data (e.g., recovery-orientation)
- We will provide plenty of notice before launching a web or telephone survey (at least 30 days), and we will try to provide adequate time for stakeholders to respond

Questions?