



PLACER COUNTY

MHSA Data Collection

Background on data collection

- ▣ 2010- Community-driven input for evaluation and reporting requirements on PEI activities
- ▣ 2011- Narrowing of reporting requirements and created first version of documentation
- ▣ Spring 2012- Created a model that was consistent across all MHSA activities
 - ❖ Ease administrative burden
 - ❖ Consistency of reporting requirements

Data System Infrastructure

- Initially Word Documents
- Current System:
 - ❖ Excel Spreadsheets
 - ❖ Used in all MHSA Components
 - ❖ Data is copied into spreadsheets per activity and then compiled into a master for demographics
- Future System:
 - ❖ Standardized Satisfaction Surveys
 - ❖ Master sheet for like measures (YOQ, Eyberg, etc.)
 - ❖ Expectation of Validated/Cultural Driven Tools

Interface to data system

Process of data collection:

- ❑ Completed by Provider (county or contractor)
- ❑ Electronically sent to County Liaison
- ❑ Merged into Master Spreadsheet

Uses of data:

- ❑ County Evaluation Team
- ❑ Community Planning Process
- ❑ EQRO and other audits

Content of data reports

Based on 3 Quadrant Model

- ❖ What/How much do we do?
- ❖ How well do we do it?
- ❖ Is anyone better off? Did we make a difference?

Content of data reports

- Quadrant 1- Demographics and Contract Requirements
 - ❖ Unduplicated served
 - ❖ Age Groups
 - ❖ Ethnicity
 - ❖ Primary Language
 - ❖ Gender
 - ❖ Veteran/ Active Military
 - ❖ Contract Requirements
- Quadrant 2
 - ❖ Satisfaction Survey
 - ❖ Completion of Services
- Quadrant 3
 - ❖ Measurable outcome (at least one)

Outcomes

Is anyone better off? Did we make a difference?

- ❑ Customized to each activity
- ❑ Fidelity expected with EBP
- ❑ Provider holds the hard/individual data
- ❑ Provider provides the evaluation of the data
- ❑ Reports change scores/data

Limitations

- ❑ Lack of funding for evaluation
- ❑ Lack of research and evaluation experience by providers