**Sixteen State Performance Indicator Project**
**June 21, 2001 Conference Call**

Minutes reported by Ellen Sparks, South Carolina

1. **States Present:** AZ, CO, CT, DC, IL, IN, MO, NY, OK, RI, SC, TX, UT, VT, WA, also Ron Manderscheid, Ted Lutterman, and Vijay Ganju.

2. **Special Topics:**

**Final Report Workgroup -** Ted Lutterman: About 20 people met at the National Conference to discuss the format and content of the Final Report. A draft outline and proposed attachments were sent out on the list-serv for review. The group is proposing two sets of reports, an individual state level report and a report for the entire project. The individual state report would be completed by each state in October and then this information would be used to write the overall report for the project. In addition, an appendix containing workgroup results and data tables would be included in the final report.

It was proposed that State reports would include an Executive Summary, Introduction, Status of the development of the indicators and discussion of each of the indicators, indicators unique to the state, and resources required. There was some discussion about the ability to capture in a comparable way across states, the resources required to produce the indicators. It was noted that this data was useful after the Five State Study and parameters for collecting this data may be discussed in the next round of grants prior to the project rather than at its completion.

The National Summary Report would stand on its own to be used for a variety of purposes. Results of the project would be included in the body of the report and detailed data would be included in the appendices. The grant period ends 9/30/01 and draft state reports should be completed in October so that the final report can be completed sometime in the Fall (hopefully, mid-October, so states need to get reports to Ted to compile by mid-September). States can put more data into their reports later, as they compile it.

Ron asked about putting all the data in some kind of central place, and suggested one of the workgroups look into this. It was suggested that the group that worked on putting the data on the website work on this. Action: It was recommended that Ted send these drafts out again for everyone to review and send comments to him byJuly 15. Then the committee will get together again and finalize the outlines.

**Children's Workgroup -** Randy Koch: The workgroup met at the National Conference also and finalized the Youth Services Survey and the Youth Services Survey for Families. Copies of the survey and guidelines for administration are on the MHSIP website. Comments can be given to Randy. The workgroup had a conversation with Paul Cleary the developer of the children's ECHO, and his group, the purpose of which was to avoid conflict and confusion that occurred with the separate development of the CABHS and ECHO surveys after the MHSIP adult survey had been implemented. Paul is willing

to work together on the child and parent instruments. He is in the early stages and so changes can easily be made. Judy Hall, Molly Brunk, and Randy will meet to look at data and maybe come up with a public domain instrument. ECHO funds run out in September so hopefully the meeting can be arranged this summer; however CMHS is committed to supporting the children's survey development in the future. The ECHO instrument is geared toward participants in a health plan and some items are only relevant to that population. Action: Randy will send a reminder about the Youth Services Survey to the 16 states and, if there are comments, please send them to him.

**Six Month Data** - Denny Geertsen: Some of the states can only report six months of data for certain indicators. Denny has made a recommendation that some data such as Contact within Seven Days be reported for a six- month period. Other indicators that may be considered for reporting for six months include employment, living arrangements, possibly level of functioning and diagnosis. A distinction is needed between recording standards and reporting standards.
Action: Denny will conduct a quick survey before the next conference call regarding the collection of data for six months.

**ACT/SE** - John McGrew: Sent preliminary results of checklists out. This is preliminary because two states have yet to report, but data will probably be the same. Essentially what is found is that the checklists are good, i.e., results using them correlate well with more detailed fidelity measures.. Recommendations include a hierarchical system of operationally equivalent measures and standards for ACT and SE. This includes using (1) national accreditation standards (CARF and NAMI) John will share a website address with more information, (2) State standards, (3) fidelity scales and (4) checklists. Send feedback to John regarding the recommendations. He will give state-by-state results after review of the data by the states.

**Stakeholder Participation** - Donna Stimpson: Has 100% participation in the survey and is in the process of analysis of the preliminary findings. Will review findings with workgroup within two weeks and then with entire group in one month.

**Website Presentation** - Data for the website is not yet final. Group hopes to finalize by 7/2 and questions need to be resolved by then. There is a plan to add a second round of indicators, e.g., cost data, to the website and, again, give contributors a chance to review their state's data before it is made public.

**Hospital (ORYX-like) Indicators** - States need to start to put this data together by summer. Bernadette Phalen has drafted a template to report data. She will go back to the workgroup regarding which states can report data in the template, since some 16-state projects do not have access to the Oryx data that has already been submitted to NRI. Bernadette will send a notice and states are asked to get feedback to her by next week.

**Diagnosis Update** - Bernadette states there will be uniformity for data for 2001, sporadic use of the new categories for the other years. Bernadette will send an email and complete the table.

**Employment** - Denny Geersten: There are five categories to report for employment and data may be collected every six months to determine change. Denny sent employment definitions out. There was a suggestion from John McGrew to make category 1: competitive and
category 2: non-competitive. Action: Get feedback to Denny. The workgroup will also consider the issue of competitive category.

**Next Conference Call:** The next conference call is scheduled for **8/2/2001 at 2:00 pm EST.**
(Utah will not be able to attend).