



Cultural and Linguistic Competency Committee Meeting Minutes
Date: Wednesday, May 10, 2017 | Time: 1:00pm-3:30pm

MHSOAC Office
1325 J Street, Suite 1700, Sacramento, CA 95814
Darrell Steinberg Conference Room

****DRAFT****

| Committee Members: | Staff: | Other Attendees: |
|-----------------------------|---------------------|-------------------------|
| Reneeta Anthony, Vice Chair | Kristal Antonicelli | Stacie Hiramoto |
| Herman DeBose | Angela Brand | Steve Leoni* |
| Kimberly Diggles | Tom Orrock | Raja Mitry* |
| Michael Helmick | Filomena Yeroshek | Katherine Ferry |
| Elisa Jimenez | | Melen Vue |
| JoAnn Johnson | | |
| Kalima Llyas | | |
| Rita Mehia | | |
| Elaine Peng | | |
| Hector Ramirez | | |
| Edward Soto | | |
| Miriam Vega | | |
| Poshi Walker | | |

*Participation by phone

Committee members absent: Khatera Aslami-Tamplen, Tando Gaduka, Leslie Hillenbrand, Kali Patterson

Welcome/Introductions

MHSOAC Manager Tom Orrock called the meeting to order and welcomed everyone. He notified all participants that the Vice Chair, Commissioner Reneeta Anthony, had been delayed and that in the interim, he would facilitate until she arrived. Agenda items requiring a vote were to be postponed until Commissioner Anthony arrived and that the meeting would begin with Agenda Item 3. Introductions were provided by all present in the room as well as on the phone.

A brief update was provided to the Committee that the Commission would be hosting a community mental health forum in Los Angeles in mid-August and was seeking 3 volunteers from the CLCC to be part of the planning. Contact information was provided to meeting participants for follow up.

Agenda Item 3: Phase II MHSOAC Transparency Tool

MHSOAC Deputy Director Brian Sala, Ph.D., provided the Committee with an overview of the in-progress development of the MHSOAC Fiscal Transparency tool (a sample of the materials covered can be found online at: https://projects.invisionapp.com/share/WDAWW8HNU#/screens/225543483_Home) Dr. Sala previewed the tool and reported that it would be publically available near the end of the month. He provided an explanation of some of the features of the tool as developed under Phase One which included how to find out how counties have spent MHSOAC funds, amount of unspent funds, and Phase Two, which is focused on the type of programs that are available in each county and statewide.

The Committee was asked to provide feedback as one of the goals of the tool is to create awareness of available funding, programs and facilitate a greater level of engagement from the community at the county level including the ability of stakeholders to hold county mental health department accountable for how money is spent at the local level. The Committee was also provided with a brief overview of the Phase One and Phase Two stages of development; Phase One was focused on fiscal transparency and went through significant review and comment. Phase Two, as outlined in the meeting was focused on moving toward classification of programs.

The Committee was asked to consider providing input on the classification system at this early stage to ensure community input on the process. The Fiscal Transparency Tool's was designed to organize data from Revenue and Expenditure Reports (RERs) to help the public understand spending and funds tracking related to reversion. The classification scheme for all MHSOAC programs would be based on information as identified in the last submitted 3 year plans and annual updates and the tool would be designed to provide an inventory of programs provided at county level building on the existing NAMI California catalogue of MHSOAC programs with the overall goal to provide a tool for meaningful comparisons across counties with regard to all SB82 PEI, INN, FSP, and CSS programs.

While the OAC is not a referral agency, the Commission is seeking correct and helpful information to support the creation of a system that is sensitive to keyword items and common language and phrases and not just librarian based search language including less academia and more common stakeholder language, how to organize the descriptors used, and what are other applications that would be helpful.

The Committee was asked to consider what would be the right kind of search interfaces based on stakeholder feedback and needs to further enrich available info, to support better access and linkage and to support a robust CPP. The goal is to gather feedback on how to describe/categorize programs and make information more accessible; frame as ongoing for continuous improvement.

The Committee discussed the tool and the information presented and provided the following feedback:

- Concern regarding the lack of time given to the Committee members to review the materials and the project. Members felt unprepared to respond and participate as no background information had been previously presented to give context on what Phase One was versus what Phase Two would entail.
- Explore strategies to outreach to NAMI California and other statewide entities to explore what they want to see in addition to sending out surveys/questionnaires or other tools to gain a better understanding.
- Addition of or definition of terminology and a “see also” tool, to provide clear language and think through expansion of the search filters. For example: how/when TAY are captured if it’s an all age program? If an individual searches for TAY, will all programs come up, including those that serve adults?
- How to discern intersectional identities and populations within the search tool.
- Exploring how to identify programs and services specific to the refugee community and African community; what terminology would they use; some populations don’t have definitions, don’t have English based understanding.
- Ongoing updates would be difficult for small counties and may place an undue burden on their staff.
- Addition of a zip code filter would help narrow by region and not quite as broadly as county.
- The need for translation and multilingual functions.
- Consider that the map as presented may be incomplete as not all services are fully funded by MHSA.
- Provide information on a program’s access points.
- Explore options to incorporate information about how referrals to identified programs work, noting availability of program navigators and how to create a trip navigator to understand how service continuums work with each county.
- Tool should reflect multiple audiences - a clinical search and a layman search to account for differences in vernacular, needs and understanding.
- How to leverage newly awarded stakeholder contracts as the tool would be very helpful to educate new advocates on what is happening at the county level.
- Ask counties for key terms to help determine subject heading and key terms for program identification and to think about the use of symbols to help with language barriers.

- The use of a legend for individuals to be able translate with symbols.
- Inclusion of a mechanism for user to know if this is a safe program, a welcoming place with culturally appropriate programs.
- Incorporating a service needs questionnaire to help direct users to programs.
- Organize the data to ensure access to information for racial and ethnic programs and disaggregation of data by race, sexuality, language, etc; current categories are too basic.
- Use of multiple key word searches for consumers would be helpful to expand options for results queries.
- Develop the tool to be mobile optimized.
- Focus on how things are tagged so they may be caught by Google or other search engines.
- Explore ideas around how to use the tool to effectively direct individuals to emergency or crisis/triage help.

The Committee also discussed areas where members felt that they needed additional clarification. Those items included:

- Clarification on where the MHSOAC was at in the process and the timeline for completion.
- How will the MHSOAC demonstrate relevancy and value for a “directory” and how to address the challenge of the currency of available data?
- What will be the use of standard data collection instruments and what will be the mechanism for determining outcomes and data?
- Clarification on how the MHSOAC would organize the data and how it would be used.
- How would the MHSOAC assess the cultural competency of the programs and to how would the information reach people without internet or computer access.
- Review of next steps and asked for upcoming meeting materials to be sent in advance for review.

Dr. Sala concluded his presentation and noted that he would be back to brief the Committee at a future meeting.

Public Comment

There was no additional public comment provided on this item.

Agenda Item 1: Adoption of the March 8, 2017 Meeting Minutes

The Committee (Committee) took a moment to review the minutes. One edit was requested on page 3, paragraph 8, line 2 of the meeting minutes to add “sexual orientation” after “gender identity.”

Committee also discussed:

- Clarification about the status of action items as a result of previous meetings.
- Concern about the lack of time to thoroughly review meeting materials; 10 days is not enough time to review minutes.
- Support for including names on the meeting minutes as it may help foster better communication; opportunity for clarification with the individual who made the comments.
- The proper process for having an item added to the agenda or actionable items to be brought to the Committee by the public.

Filomena Yeroshek, MHSOAC Chief Counsel noted that the agenda guides focus of the meeting. If an item is brought up, it is up to the committee to determine action and what to follow up with. Public comment is to inform the decision making process but recommended that the Committee stay focused on the charter when making decisions about action items.

Michael Helmick made the motion to approve minutes from the May 10, 2017 CLCC Committee meeting; motion was seconded by Herman Debose. Motion carried and minutes were approved with modifications requested to include “sexual orientation” on page 3.

Vote recorded with participating members as follows:

- Approve: Commissioner Anthony, Herman Debose, Kimberly Diggles, Michale Helmick, Elisa Jimenez, JoAnn Johnson, Kalima Llyas, Rita Mehia, Elaine Peng, Edward Soto, Miriam Vega, Poshi Walker.
- Abstain: n/a

Agenda Item 2: Adoption of the CFLC Charter

The Committee reviewed the Charter document. Commissioner Anthony asked for discussion on the items as presented. The Committee provided the following feedback regarding modifications or proposed changes to the Charter document:

- The purpose and goals were not clearly stated. The Charter document should clearly outline specific goals and objectives; the purpose isn't part of the statement provided.
- Change “lend” to “provide” in the Charter Activities section description.

- Change “experts” to “provide training” in the Charter Activities section
- Add the ability for the members of the CFLC to be a part of RFP review teams
- Addition of “sexual orientation” to the last sentence under purpose and goals.
- Consider the different options for training the Commission taking into account that the Commission calendar is very tight and it may be difficult to schedule time for training; when trainings are cancelled or bumped from the agenda, it sends the message that it isn’t important and the Committee should not drop this.
- Adding a provision to require a sitting committee member to be on all MHSOAC workgroups.
- Further explore the use of the short video outlined and whether a video would be able to effectively communicate strategies for culturally competence service delivery in such a brief medium.
- LGBTQ to be identified along with culture.
- suggestion on 1A under activities; individuals from different cultures...add after background including age and disabilities including deaf and hard of hearing; needs often overlooked

The Committee discussed the provision for training and education. The following feedback was noted:

- Consider the different options for training the Commission taking into account that the Commission calendar is very tight and it may be difficult to schedule time for training; when trainings are cancelled or bumped from the agenda, it sends the message that it isn’t important and the Committee should not drop this.
- Modify Activity 2 to enable the Committee to provide multiple trainings based on needs; the Committee may want to consider more training opportunities if needs supersede just one training; one may be too limiting.
- How to address procedures in place but no positive outcomes of the work; education on cultural diversity is necessary. She noted her own experience working in communities and her observation that the community and the public do not have sensitivity and knowledge needed. She noted disappointment and encouraged the Committee to think about the actionable steps to educate and bring positive voice to activities. Education is necessary and actually needs to be completed.
- The Committee also discussed the idea that often, Cultural Competency trainings are a “preaching to the choir” activity. That the audience of the Committee is already culturally competent. They also discussed the use of the short video and ways to think about using the programs developed through

the California Reducing Disparities Project to create reports as well as how to leverage relationship between OHE and MHSOAC to talk about access and understanding of communities.

- Training is a yearly discussion and one training is not enough. She noted that in prior years, the Commission has been too busy and it ends up that only one training can be completed because of time and that the training is usually high level given broad needs and time constraints.

The Committee discussed other general component of the Charter including how to get additional information about the CRDP project and to learn more about current OHE projects and things underway including a review of the 5 CRDP population reports to address strategies on how to outreach and engage and to also support CLCC members to attend workgroup meetings to gain further perspective.

The Committee also discussed looking at what the Committees are doing and how any information gets back to the Commission and how Committee members know that their work has made a difference. The Committees require time and expense and members felt it would be helpful to understand their impact. Committee members would like to be more advisory and provide input to the Commission on their work.

Additionally, the Committee briefly discussed AB 850 which would add a member to the Commission with SME on diverse racial and ethnic communities. One way that the Commission can acknowledge and validate these needs would be to add a member to the Commission body.

The Committee also spent time discussing the Charter as whole. Members encouraged the group not to spend too much time on the additions, but rather to recognize differences and experiences with the understanding that the Committee only has a year at a time to get the work done; that the discussion was getting lost in the minutiae. There was concern that the more the Committee talks about the work, the less time there is to actually do the work and cautioned against self-sabotaging efforts.

Many on the Committee felt that there was a need for the Committee to move forward, promote the importance of having CLCC included in other workgroups, and utilize the Committee as an advisory board and see ideas elevated to the Commission, that the point of discussion can and should inform the charter. The Committee requested ongoing follow up of activities to demonstrate the impact of their work as it is often discouraging for any group or body to not feel impactful.

Based on the discussion, MHSOAC Chief Counsel provided clarification to the request that Committee members should serve on RFP review panels. The Public Contracting Code (PCC) is very explicit in that only state employees are allowed to score proposals regardless that some have shared that other agencies allow community reviewers; that the MHSOAC follows the standard laid out by the PCC and state administrative manual on solicitations.

JoAnn Johnson made the motion to approve the CLCC Charter document; motion was seconded by Hector Ramirez. Motion carried and Charter was approved without modification.

Vote recorded with participating members as follows:

- Approve: Commissioner Anthony, JoAnn Johnson, Elaine Peng, Hector Ramirez, Miriam Vega, Poshi Walker.
- Do Not Approve: Michael Helmick, Kalima Llyas, Rita Mehia
- Abstain: Herman Dubose, Kimberly Diggles

Public Comment

Public comment echoed support for CLCC members to serve on policy project and workgroups. Additional public comment encouraged training to move away from what cultural competence looks like and to focus more on specific underserved communities.

*****Because of time constraints, Agenda Item 4: Community Involvement Protocols and Agenda Item 5: Mental Health Crisis Triage Request for Application (RFA) were not discussed.***

Agenda Item 6: Discussion of Future Agenda Items for July 12th Meeting

Commissioner Anthony asked the Committee for recommendations for future agenda items. Committee members suggested discussions on:

- County 3 Year Plans and Annual Updates
- An update on the Fiscal Transparency Tool
- Stakeholder Advocacy Contracts
- Triage RFA
- Committee member participation on MHSOAC workgroups and subcommittees
- The activities of the CRDP Project at Office of Health Equity
- Fiscal Transparency Tool update
- MHSO providers and insurance

Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:05pm