

Summary Notes from Evaluation Work Group Meeting
September 6, 2013

Present:

Walter Shwe	Susan Wilson	Pat Bennett	Carol Hood
Jane Adcock	Karen Hart		

No changes or additions to Summary Notes of August 22nd meeting.

Reviewed Priority Indicator Chart and discussed the following:

UCLA has operationalized the priority indicators thru a contract with MHSOAC. The level of detail needed to get into it and agree on the domains is very deep. It is challenging to get consistent data and it is difficult to agree on the calculations.

Counties do not all use standardized, consistent definitions. One must give them specific definitions and calculation formulas for the counties to be able to extract a data report.

Raw data doesn't really mean anything without the formulas. Millions of questions go into each indicator to define it and drill down to the specifics.

Good data in mental health is complicated by 2 things: 1) the data system is not modern nor up-to-date (there are other systems that allow the user to upload data and immediately receive feedback) and 2) when the system is not user friendly then it is unlikely to be used in a meaningful way.

So while the Council could ask Counties to produce reports, it would be very difficult due to the facts above. Recommended that the Council use the data that UCLA has created for fiscal years 2004-05 and 2009-10 and perhaps do a comparison between the years. The data is for all clients not just those receiving FSP level of services.

Next meeting to occur in lieu of Executive Committee meeting on Friday, 9/20 at 9am

Jane to attempt to populate the draft work plan for evaluation activities. Pat to share templates for evaluation plans.