



**CULTURAL AND LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE COMMITTEE (CLCC)
MEETING MINUTES • AUGUST 18, 2016**

TIME and LOCATION: CLCC assembled at 1:08pm, in the MHSOAC Steinberg Conference Room and via Teleconference.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Khatera Aslami-Tamplen (Chair), Blia Cha, Katherine Ferry, JoAnn Johnson, Raja Mitry, David Weikel, Minola Clark Manson (via teleconference), Sharon Jones (via teleconference).

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Poshie Mikalson-Walker

MEMBERS ABSENT: Tina Wooton (Vice-Chair), Susan Manzi

MHSOAC Staff: Dr. Brian Sala (Deputy Director), Fred Molitor, Kim Johnson, Greg Tate

WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS:

The meeting started at 1:08pm.

POSTPONED REVIEW OF BAGLEY-KEENE OPEN MEETING ACT:

The review of the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act is postponed due to a scheduling conflict. The presentation will be conducted at a future meeting. The Chair believes the lack of knowledge about the Act is creating barriers to achieving a quorum. More communication is needed in regards to informing committee members of the requirements for posting the notices ten days in advance.

A suggestion was made for counties, providers, local boards, and commissions to host a public site for Committee meetings. If counties cooperate on this level and the OAC posts it, then it can encourage stakeholder participation. The Chair recommended Committee members find ways to engage clients and families and encourage more participation in the meetings as indicated in the CLCC Charter.

REVIEW AND APPROVE JUNE 9, 2016, MEETING MINUTES:

Review and approval of the 9 June 2016 meeting minutes.

Public Comment: None.

Motion to approve the minutes by Joann Johnson.

Motion seconded by Raja Mitry.

Roll Call: The motion passes.

Comments on Minutes from 9 June Meeting:

Raja Mitry would like to modify his wording and commentary from the last meeting to reflect sensitivity toward older adults. He feels it is more accurate to describe the older age group as transitioning and with changing roles. It is preferable to use the terms continual and changing identity and transition rather than continual loss.

At the “Future meetings” second line, insert “and” before, “...have teleconference capabilities.”

Discussion On Meeting Venues:

The Committee is seeking clarity on the CLCC meetings as teleconferences or in-person meetings. The CLCC Chair supports the value of in-person meetings.

According to the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act, participation locations for committee members must be publicly noticed in the posted Agenda and those locations must be publicly accessible. Members should advise MHSOAC staff in advance of the ten-day agenda posting deadline for each Committee meeting, whether they are calling in or attending in person.

DEMOGRAPHIC REPORTING TRENDS DATA:

This segment is to provide general discussion of demographic reporting trend data issues. Fred Molitor and Brian Sala attended a site visit in San Diego. It was an opportunity to speak with County staff and providers about PEI and INN demographics. Participants provided feedback on some data collection challenges. The US Census Bureau is revising its demographic data collection methodology. This change is to provide separate questions regarding race, ancestry, and ethnicity. Since the 1980s the Census has relied on self-identity questions and a “decline to state” option. It has been challenging for the Census Bureau on how to approach these questions.

Part of the MHSOAC’s goal is to get a better understanding of unserved/underserved populations. With the current structure it is difficult to identify populations that are non/underserved. The key is determining underserved from served populations. This suggests important data collection efforts should be well matched with collections taken elsewhere because it will be the basis for collecting of data on other populations. The Commission’s PEI and INN regulations are in effect and counties must carry out the regulations’ requirements. However, it is incumbent upon the MHSOAC to help Counties identify and share information on best practice strategies on the data collection requirements.

The regulations place reporting requirements on the counties. The regulations do not specify how the counties are to collect the data. There may be lack of clarity between

providers and the counties as to what the State is actually requiring of providers. The counties determine what is required of providers. The counties are required to report to the State certain programs and activities. The counties can use any valid sampling technique rather than a complete participant census. Mental health populations are technically challenging to survey because of the need to understand un/under-served subpopulations. Sampling of very small groups should be included. The increasing tendency of individuals to identify as multi-cultural or multi-ethnic is also challenging.

The CLCC should know what is currently being collected, data trends, and legislation that mandates collection of this information. Exploring data and racial data reporting trends are in the CLCC Charter. Data collection is simple but it can be a significant cost increase for counties.

Counties vary in their data collection approaches. In one county the Electronic Health Records disaggregate more than the State. Reports to the State therefore may recombine some sub-categories that are important locally. It is important, therefore, to distinguish between local data collection strategies and statewide reporting requirements to understand differences between local needs and statewide data reports.

Committee members noted that there are some State constituencies with sizable populations not currently being measured (or measured appropriately) in the statewide data requirements. An example is Glendale with large Armenian numbers. Alameda and Fremont have a large Afghani population. Afghani would be listed under the White category. Middle Eastern category is not an ethnicity. It is a geopolitical term. It needs to be broken down as Arab or Iranian. Afghani is a Caucasian race which falls under White but some may identify as Asian, geographically. There are nuances that matter because of constituents that are particular to California. These ideas speak to objectives with demographic reporting requirements and not about categorizing about race and ethnicities but about meeting service needs in communities. The questions to answer are: What are the external mechanisms for measuring penetration rates for underserved populations? What are other major institutions doing in terms of race and ethnicity?

Chair Aslami-Tamplen states these questions and research goes with the CLCC Charter. The CLCC wants to know what is going on with the Census Bureau and to review information. At the next meeting, the CLCC should look at local and State entities' data.

Brief mention of AB1726 (APIAHF) Rob Bonta, Author, AAPI Data Disaggregation Bill to disaggregate Asian data.

Dr. Katherine Elliott – Introduction and Data Discussion:

Dr. Elliott was on the CLCC Committee ten years ago. She is a clinical psychologist and practiced at UC Davis. Her passion is reducing disparities. Entities should be consistent with capturing and using data.

The new Census approach is great, however, it should be the bottom line because in Alameda, Sacramento, and Los Angeles Counties they are already doing cutting edge programs. The CLCC can work with Dr. Elliott to craft a protocol to incorporate ethnic and racial policies.

IRP UPDATE:

The Subcommittee had three meetings. The next step is for OAC staff to draft a project report based upon information obtained at the meetings. The report will highlight best practices from stakeholder perspectives. The IRP discussions have brought about a conversation with San Bernardino County acknowledging the need for data collection. It is not about the necessity of a tracking log but about trying to learn from issues with stakeholders and what the counties are doing about those issues.

Public Comment on IRP Update:

When MHSA first passed the IRP was not about service resolution. It was a way of reporting out issues around the stakeholder process and the means of speaking up about misallocation of funds.

MHSOAC Current Projects Update:

There are three additional Commission projects. The Children's Crisis Project will wrap up within the next month. The August Commission meeting is holding a panel discussion about Fiscal Reversion Policy (revising fiscal regulations on reversion). The presentation will be about raising core questions of what is the policy, evolution of the policy, challenges regarding the policy, and the next steps.

In September, Los Angeles County will host a workgroup and site visit with the Criminal Justice (CJ) and Mental Health (MH) Project. It will be at the Twin Towers Correctional Facility. It is not an open or public meeting. The public engagement meeting is 21 September. The bulk of the agenda will be panel presentations about CJ and MH. The objective is a broad understanding of key issues and strategies the OAC can advocate for in diminishing involvement with persons with mental illness in the CJ system. There is a proposal for a community forum, possibly in Stanislaus County, to focus on the CJ and MH Project. Ashley Mills is the CJ and MH Project Manager. If any members of the CLCC have expertise or information with CJ and MH please contact Brian Sala (Brian.Sala@mhsoc.ca.gov). The OAC is looking for key representatives in supporting panels and conversation around the CJ and MH Project.

David Weikel volunteered to assist with the CJ and MH Project. He was a discharge planner in the jails, has experience writing grants, and would like to be involved in the project. Dr. Weikel volunteered Madera County for the forum and indicated the venue can hold 200 people.

Fred Molitor is heading up MH and the Schools Project. In October, there will be a discussion about plans for that project. The target for a Community Forum around the MH and Schools Project is targeted for early 2017. Chair Aslami-Tamplen noted that planned to drive from the San Diego Alternatives Conference to the September Commission meeting in Los Angeles and might be able to provide transportation to other attendees at the conference who wished to attend the Commission meeting.

AGENDA ITEMS FOR OCTOBER 13, 2016 MEETING:

- ❖ Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act briefing.
- ❖ Project: Reversion Policy presentation.
- ❖ Project: Mental Health in Schools presentation.
- ❖ Project: Criminal Justice and Mental Health presentation.
- ❖ Project: IRP update.
- ❖ Demographic Reporting Trends (Dr. Elliott).
- ❖ Travel Reimbursement procedures and policy.

GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENT:

Michael Helmick attended the first meeting of the MH and CJ Project. He was disappointed with the lack of representatives of color at the meeting compared to the overrepresentation [of people of color] in the CJ system. His hope, going forward, is for the Committee to increase meeting attendance. More outreach to communities affected by the CJ system is necessary. CA Coalition for Mental Health (CCMH) has a workgroup that is focusing on Criminal Justice and it might be good to engage with them. In regards to the Education workgroup: NYAPRS (New York Association of Psychiatric Rehabilitation Services) is collecting expulsion rates for African-Americans and Latino boys. The expulsion rate is incredibly high for Black and Latino males.

Note: There was music and sound interruptions on the phone. Callers had to hang up and call back in at 2:56pm.

MEETING ADJOURNED AT 3:07pm

Next Meeting Date: The next meeting is 13 October 2016.