

SBHIP PROJECT OUTCOME REPORT RESPONSE GUIDELINES

Evaluation Criteria

DHCS will use the following evaluation parameters to determine the adequacy of the respective SBHIP Project Outcome Report submission responses and points awarded:

- The Project Outcome Report is worth 35 points.
- Project Outcome Report deliverables with omitted requested information will receive a score of zero (0) for that specific item.
- No partial credit will be given for any narrative response, but there will be partial credit for performance measures that demonstrate progress toward the selected performance outcome metrics.
- Individual responses within the Project Outcome Report deliverable must include specific answers for every Local Educational Agency (LEA) partner identified as a recipient of the specific targeted intervention.
- The Project Outcome Report must address all the evaluation factors for each selected intervention.

There are a total of 35 points available for each selected intervention within this deliverable. If the Project Outcome Report deliverable receives an initial score below 80%, DHCS will contact the Medi-Cal Managed Care Plan (MCP) and provide an opportunity to revise and resubmit the deliverable within an appropriately established timeframe. SBHIP Project Outcome Reports that receive a final score below 80% will not receive full funding for this deliverable.

Project Outcome Report Response Guidelines

Project Outcome Report responses should be clear, detailed, and help DHCS to understand the impact of each implemented Targeted Intervention on the specific student populations within each selected LEA. Where possible, responses should incorporate quantitative (i.e., numerical) data to support responses (e.g., number of school staff trained, number of students accessing a wellness center, number of family events and total attendees) to demonstrate program impact.

The *Project Outcome Report Evaluation Guidelines* are additional guidance and examples **to consider** when responding to the open-ended questions in the Project Outcome

Report. The Project Outcome Report will be evaluated in accordance with the evaluation criteria noted in the “SBHIP Overview and Requirements” document.¹ MCPs **are not required** to follow the guidance to receive points on the Project Outcome Report.

¹ Project Outcome Report scoring criteria can be found on the SBHIP website in the “SBHIP Overview and Requirements” document (<https://www.dhcs.ca.gov/services/Pages/studentbehavioralheathincentiveprogram.aspx>).

Project Outcome Report — Milestone Two	
Project Outcome Report Questions or Fields	Guidelines to Consider/Examples
Field: Identify at least two distinct measures that were used to assess the impact of the intervention. Include the date the performance measure was collected or taken post-SBHIP targeted intervention	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the MCP identify at least two distinct measures that were used to assess the impact of the intervention? 2. Do the identified measures align with the measures included in the corresponding Project Plan submitted by the MCP at the start of the SBHIP? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Note: Accelerated plans were submitted on June 1, 2022, and standard plans were submitted on December 31, 2022. 3. Did the MCP identify the date the final performance measure was collected? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The data collection date should ideally reflect July 2024 or later.
Fields: Measure 1: Baseline performance measure used to evaluate intervention impact Measure 2: Baseline performance measure used to evaluate intervention impact	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the MCP report on the two baseline performance measures used to evaluate the impact of the intervention? 2. Does each baseline performance measure align with the measures the MCP identified in the Project Plan? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If there are differences between the baseline measures provided in the Project Plan and the Project Outcome Report, did the MCP explain the rationale for the difference? 3. If the baseline measure(s) were unavailable during the submission of the Project Plan, did the MCP indicate when the baseline measure(s) were determined and identified within a Bi-Quarterly Report? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does each baseline performance measure align with the measures the

Project Outcome Report — Milestone Two	
Project Outcome Report Questions or Fields	Guidelines to Consider/Examples
	<p>MCP identified within a Bi-Quarterly Report?</p> <p>b. If there are differences between the baseline measures provided within a Bi-Quarterly Report and the Project Outcome Report, did the MCP explain the rationale for the difference?</p>
<p>Fields:</p> <p>Measure 1: Performance measure post SBHIP Targeted Intervention</p> <p>Measure 2: Performance measure post SBHIP Targeted Intervention</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the MCP report on the two performance measures post-SBHIP Targeted Intervention used to evaluate the impact of the intervention? 2. Does each measure align with the measures the MCP identified in the Project Plan? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If there are differences between the performance measures provided in the Project Outcome Report compared to the measures identified in the Project Plan, did the MCP explain the rationale for the change? 3. Did each measure meet the anticipated intervention outcomes identified by the MCP in the Project Plan? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If the measure did not meet the anticipated outcomes, did the MCP explain the rationale for the change and demonstrate progress compared to the baseline performance measure?
<p>1. Identify and explain, clearly and in detail, any differences in the LEA(s) initially identified as intervention recipients, with those LEA(s) that actually received the intervention. If no</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the MCP identify any differences between the LEA(s) initially identified as intervention recipients and those who actually received the intervention? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If differences were identified, did the MCP explain the rationale behind the change? For example, the MCP may include the limited

Project Outcome Report — Milestone Two	
Project Outcome Report Questions or Fields	Guidelines to Consider/Examples
differences in selected partners throughout the SBHIP, indicate N/A. (250 words or less per LEA)	capacity of LEA(s) to participate, or a County Offices of Education (COE) decision to change LEA partners.
2. Identify, clearly and in detail, the characteristics of the student population that were impacted by the selected intervention for each selected LEA. (250 words or less per LEA)	1. Did the MCP describe the student population impacted by the intervention for each LEA? For example, the number or percentage of students who are Medi-Cal beneficiaries, the demographic composition (e.g., race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation), and/or specific age groups.
3. Identify, clearly and in detail, how this intervention increased access to prevention, early intervention, and other behavioral health services on or near school campuses or by a school-affiliated behavioral health provider within each selected LEA. (250 words or less per LEA)	1. Did the MCP describe how the intervention increased student access to behavioral health services for each selected LEA? a. Did the MCP include data and metrics to demonstrate increased access (e.g., increased number of students receiving behavioral health services, increased number of school sites with a wellness center, increased number of school-affiliated behavioral health providers)? 2. If increased access was not an outcome, did the MCP describe a potential rationale for the lack of increased access, such as unforeseen external factors? Did the MCP include steps taken to increase access?
4. Explain, clearly and in detail, how this intervention helped serve the behavioral health needs of students that are Medi-Cal beneficiaries in each selected LEA. (250 words or less per LEA)	1. Did the MCP describe how the intervention helped serve Medi-Cal beneficiaries in each LEA? a. Did the MCP include data, as available, to demonstrate the benefit to Medi-Cal beneficiaries (e.g., increased number of referrals made for Medi-Cal students, improved utilization of services)?

Project Outcome Report — Milestone Two	
Project Outcome Report Questions or Fields	Guidelines to Consider/Examples
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. If the MCP does not have access to data for Medi-Cal beneficiaries, did the MCP include insights from an alternate data source (e.g., socio-economically disadvantaged students)? Did the MCP include an explanation indicating why the LEAs do not currently have a mechanism to track Medi-Cal beneficiaries and whether there is a plan to create one?
5. Describe, clearly and in detail, the SBHIP project design components and tasks that were the most challenging to implement within each selected LEA(s). (250 words or less per LEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the MCP describe the SBHIP project components and tasks that were most challenging to implement within each selected LEA? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Did the MCP include why these components were difficult to implement and how these challenges were addressed? b. If challenges persist, did the MCP describe plans to mitigate the challenges post-SBHIP?
6. Describe, clearly and in detail, the SBHIP project design components and tasks that were the least challenging to implement within each selected LEA(s). (250 words or less per LEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the MCP describe the SBHIP design components and tasks that were the least challenging to implement within each selected LEA? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Did the MCP indicate what factors or best practices contributed to the success of these components?
7. Explain, clearly and in detail, whether the intervention implementation activities and tasks aligned with projected SBHIP timeline goals? If not, describe what specific factors impacted adherence to the initial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For each LEA, did the MCP indicate whether the intervention implementation activities aligned with SBHIP timeline goals projected in the Project Plan? 2. If activities did not adhere to proposed SBHIP timeline goals, did the MCP indicate which activities did not adhere and provide rationale /

Project Outcome Report — Milestone Two	
Project Outcome Report Questions or Fields	Guidelines to Consider/Examples
SBHIP timeline proposed. (250 words or less/LEA)	actions that were taken to address obstacles to completing those activities? a. Did the MCP include whether or not these changes were noted in the Bi-Quarterly Report(s)?
8. Describe, clearly and in detail, whether the SBHIP allocation was sufficient to successfully implement the selected intervention within each selected LEA. (250 words or less per LEA)	1. Did the MCP indicate whether the SBHIP funding allocation was sufficient to successfully implement the intervention in each LEA? a. If funding was not found to be sufficient, did the MCP detail why the funding was not sufficient (e.g., more student demand than expected, unforeseen staffing challenges, etc.) and the level of additional funding needed for successful implementation?
9. Identify other funding sources that were used to supplement the intervention, as applicable (e.g., Mental Health Student Services Act (MHSSA) grants, community grants, Medi-Cal). (250 words or less per LEA)	1. Did the MCP identify additional funding sources that were used to supplement the intervention, if any? a. If other funding sources were used, did the MCP identify how those funds support the implementation and / or sustainability of the Targeted Intervention post-SBHIP (e.g., hiring staff, purchasing materials, enhancing billing infrastructure)?
10. Describe, clearly and in detail, any unexpected outcomes (positive or negative) of the SBHIP intervention in each selected LEA(s) (This response may include, but is not limited to, intervention impact on students). (250 words or less per LEA)	1. Did the MCP describe unexpected intervention outcomes in each LEA, as applicable? For example, greater number of students impacted, fewer new staff hired, etc. a. Did the MCP include data to demonstrate the outcome(s)? b. Did the MCP suggest a cause of the unexpected outcome(s)? c. If unexpected negative outcomes were identified, did the MCP describe a plan for remediation?

Project Outcome Report — Milestone Two	
Project Outcome Report Questions or Fields	Guidelines to Consider/Examples
11. Describe, clearly and in detail, any specific aspects of the SBHIP intervention that will or should be refined/adjusted for future use in order to best serve student behavioral health needs in each selected LEA. (250 words or less per LEA)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the MCP describe any aspects of the SBHIP intervention that should be refined/adjusted for future use to best serve student behavioral health needs in each LEA? 2. Did the MCP include how specific elements may be changed to enhance success in the future?
12. Identify, clearly and in detail, any additional successes achieved as a result of the SBHIP intervention. This response may include, but is not limited to, intervention impact on students, new or strengthened partnerships, etc. (250 words or less)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the MCP identify and describe specific successes associated with SBHIP intervention(s) for each LEA (e.g., hiring behavioral health staff, development of a mobile unit, impact of Targeted Intervention on specific group or population, strengthened partnerships between MCPs and LEAs)?
13. Identify, clearly and in detail, if there are any efforts to expand the selected intervention to different geographical areas, additional LEA(s) and/or targeted student populations. Why or why not? (250 words or less)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the MCP indicate whether there are any efforts to expand the intervention? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. If there are efforts to expand, did the MCP describe why they chose to expand this intervention in these particular areas? b. If there are no efforts to expand, did the MCP provide a rationale?
14. Describe, clearly and in detail, whether the intervention will be sustained post SBHIP project completion in each selected LEA. Why or why not? (250 words or less per LEA)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the MCP indicate whether the intervention(s) will be sustained post-SBHIP in each LEA? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Did the MCP provide a rationale as to why or why not the intervention(s) will be sustained and include criteria used to reach this determination?

Project Outcome Report — Milestone Two	
Project Outcome Report Questions or Fields	Guidelines to Consider/Examples
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. If the intervention(s) will be sustained post-SBHIP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Did the MCP indicate whether the program will need to change post-SBHIP (e.g., increase or decrease availability of services, adjust operating hours, etc.)? ii. Did the MCP indicate the responsible party for sustaining the intervention? iii. Did the MCP indicate potential funding sources for sustaining the intervention?
15.If the intervention will be sustained post-SBHIP, please describe how the intervention will be monitored and enhanced overtime to ensure ongoing effectiveness. (250 words or less per LEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the intervention(s) will be sustained post-SBHIP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Did the MCP describe how the intervention will be monitored overtime (e.g., data collection, quality metrics, annual reviews)? b. Did the MCP indicate how they will use monitoring data to ensure ongoing effectiveness of the Targeted Intervention? c. If the MCP indicates they do not have a mechanism in place to monitor and continuously improve the TI, did they provide a rationale and a plan to develop such a process?
16.If the intervention will be sustained post-SBHIP, please describe how the Children and Youth Behavioral Health initiative (CYBHI) multi-payer fee schedule will be utilized to support sustainability. (250 words or less per LEA)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the intervention(s) will be sustained post-SBHIP: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Did the MCP describe how it will utilize the CYBHI multi-payer fee schedule to support sustainability (e.g., align LEA billing processes with the fee schedule to reimburse for new or expanded services)?
17.Describe, clearly and in detail, how SBHIP helped	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Did the MCP describe how SBHIP helped prepare for the requirements outlined in the

Project Outcome Report — Milestone Two	
Project Outcome Report Questions or Fields	Guidelines to Consider/Examples
MCPs prepare for the requirements outlined in the 2024 MCP Contract and All Plan Letter 23-029² surrounding school-based services and LEA Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) relationships. (250 words or less per LEA)	<p>2024 MCP Contract and All Plan Letter 23-029 surrounding school-based services and LEA MOU relationships?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> If SBHIP did help prepare the MCP, did the MCP describe the progress they made in this area (i.e., establishing relationships with COEs/LEAs, creating an infrastructure for school-based services, and developing MOUs between MCPs and third-party entities)? If SBHIP did not help prepare the MCP, did the MCP indicate what barriers currently exist?
18. Overall, would this intervention be described as a success in each selected LEA? Describe, clearly and in detail, why or why not? (250 words or less per LEA)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Did the MCP indicate whether this intervention would be described as a success for each LEA? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> If yes, did the MCP include a description of the success(es) and relevant data to demonstrate the success(es)? If a success was not identified for one or more LEAs, did the MCP provide a rationale explaining why (e.g., unable to expand wellness center due to lack of physical space, unable to obtain staff to carry out educational programming) and identify next steps to improve impact of the Targeted Intervention in the future?
19. Submit all MOUs associated with this SBHIP intervention as an attachment.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Did the MCP attach all MOUs associated with each intervention and for each LEA? MCPs must re-submit MOUs even if previously submitted to DHCS. Does the MOU include all relevant county partnerships and collaborating entities?

² The 2024 MCP Contract and All Plan Letter 23-029 can be found on the SBHIP website (<https://www.dhcs.ca.gov/formsandpubs/Documents/MMCDAPsandPolicyLetters/APL2023/APL23-029.pdf>)

Project Outcome Report — Milestone Two	
Project Outcome Report Questions or Fields	Guidelines to Consider/Examples
<p>Please use the following naming convention for the MOU attachments: [Medi-Cal MCP Name][County][MOU#]-[total#]</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BlueCrossBlueShieldLosAngelesMOU1-4.pdf • BlueCrossBlueShieldLosAngelesMOU2-4.pdf 	<p>Required partnerships include those between MCPs, COEs, other LEAs, and other MCPs who are collaborating to implement the intervention(s) within a county.</p> <p>3. Did the MCP describe how they are partnering and/or collaborating with the listed entities?</p>