

Summary Notes from Evaluation Work Group Meeting
September 20, 2013

Present:

Walter Shwe Pat Bennett Carol Hood Karen Hart Jane Adcock

Discussion opened with general ideas about evaluations. Caution not to be too careful or think cannot do any evaluation without perfect data set. There are lots of ways to look at things, assess what is happening, we just need to be creative. If we never start then we will never go anywhere.

An evaluation plan should identify the questions we want to answer, then what data sources then what methods to use and also decide what level of focus such as county, system, program or individual level.

We should lay out the questions first then think about where we can get the data.

The priority indicators have already been agreed upon as areas of performance.

The word 'evaluation' does not appear in the CMHPC mandates in Welfare and Institutions Code, rather the words, 'assess', 'review' and 'make recommendations' appear. Does this impact our approach?

Determined not to tweak the indicators but to look at aspects of them such as from the family perspective.

One possible question – To what extent are mental health systems working with criminal justice to get the people employed?

Want to ensure that as we develop questions that they are linked to the performance indicators.

Identified areas of interest for evaluation:

- trauma-informed care
- transition of 3632 to the schools (AB 114)
- integration of physical health, mental health and substance abuse
- quality of life for individuals and families

Timeline

- 9/25 Jane send out skeleton structure
- 10/2 Homework due for work group members to put content in
- 10/9 Next meeting of work group to discuss draft evaluation plan