



# California Health and Human Services Agency Community Assistance, Recovery & Empowerment (CARE) Act Data Collection, Reporting & Evaluation Subgroup Meeting Minutes

July 10, 2024 | Virtual Meeting

Meeting Materials and Recording Available on [Working Group Site](#)  
Public Zoom chat from meeting is included as an Appendix to this file

For additional information and resources, please see the following sites:

- [CARE Act Resource Center \(managed by HMA for DHCS\)](#)
- [CalHHS CARE Act Site](#)
- [Judicial Council CARE Act Site](#)

## Group Members in Virtual Attendance

- Alison Morantz
- Christopher Guevara
- Beau Hennemann (Co-chair)
- Dawn Williams
- John Parker
- Keris Myrick (Co-chair)
- Sean Evans
- Tim Lutz

## 1. Welcome, Introductions, and Goals of This Group

**Karen Linkins, Principal, Desert Vista Consulting**, opened the meeting and introduced herself and her team. She reviewed the virtual meeting guidelines for group members and members of the public.

Linkins shared ground rules for the meeting and details of the group's approach and goals.

All group members in attendance introduced themselves, beginning with the group's co-chairs, Beau Hennemann and Keris Myrick.

## 2. Recap Previous Meeting

**Karen Linkins** provided an overview of the previous meeting of the group in April. In that meeting, RAND presented a draft of their evaluation logic model and got feedback from group members.

Linkins reminded the group that minutes from all meetings can be accessed through the CARE Act Working Group website.

### 3. Discussion of CARE Implementation and Q&A

**Karen Linkins** introduced Stephanie Brooks Holliday and Melissa Labriola from the RAND Corporation to discuss their draft evaluation plan.

**Stephanie Brooks Holliday and Melissa Labriola** introduced themselves and provided an overview of their recent work and current evaluation plan:

- Since the April meeting, RAND sought stakeholder input from additional groups and made appropriate revisions to their logic model. They also added a process evaluation component to their scope.
- In the past months, RAND has drafted a participant survey and an application to their IRB.
- The evaluation will use a mixed methods approach, using quantitative and qualitative data.
- Holliday shared a slide with the updated logic model and walked the group through the changes that have been made since the last meeting.
- Holliday shared a matrix illustrating evaluation questions and the methods that will be used to answer them. Data sources will include surveys, interviews, county data, and other administrative data.
- Labriola provided more details on their planned qualitative and quantitative methods and analyses.
- Stakeholder engagement is a critical component of the evaluation process. The logistics of this engagement are still being determined.
- Labriola reviewed the core evaluation deliverables and timeline, as well as the evaluation plan next steps.

#### Questions and Discussion:

Holliday and Labriola welcomed questions and feedback from the group.

- Keris Myrick said that mentions of “mental illness recovery” in the evaluation materials should be changed to “mental health recovery” or just “recovery.” She also said that the petitioner interview questions only make sense for petitioners who have a relationship with the respondent. Labriola responded that questions will be tailored appropriately to different petitioner types.
- Myrick asked if the same questions will be posed to participants and petitioners to capture variations in perspective. Holliday confirmed that all perspectives will be captured.
- Myrick suggested that in the evaluation’s measurement of empowerment, evaluators should interpret people saying “no” as a form of empowerment, rather than non-compliance.

- Myrick asked the meeting facilitators if this group will have an opportunity to actually look at data.
- Beau Henneman asked if the evaluation will be looking at outcomes for respondents who do not participate as a control group. Holliday and Labriola responded that they are still working on confirming the plan for a control group, which is dependent on the availability of data. They discussed the challenges of some data sources they hope to use.
- John Parker asked if periodic insights from the evaluation process will be presented to stakeholder groups and counties so they can be used for process improvement. Labriola said they hope to do this, though it will not take the form of a formal report.
- Linkins said that this group will look at data once it is made available, though the first data report has not yet been released. She discussed other quality improvement efforts underway.
- Alison Morantz asked for more detail on the format of survey questions. She also asked if this group will have any input on the continued development of methods. Labriola said the statisticians on their team can loop this group into some of their processes, though their likely won't be much flexibility because of the restrictions of data sources.
- Sean Evans expressed appreciation for the process evaluation component being added to the logic model.
- Linkins echoed Evans' statement and highlighted various process considerations that the evaluation will be looking at.
- Linkins asked RAND if there has been any consideration of adding a cost benefit analysis to the evaluation plan. Labriola responded that it is too early in the process to determine if a cost benefit analysis will be possible.

## 4. Call for Public Comment

**Karen Linkins** shared instructions for how to make public comment and said that comments can also be submitted at any time via email.

- Tanya said that she liked the survey questions and said that law enforcement often do have relationships with people they may be petitioning. She shared that getting feedback from petitioners will be very useful for process improvement. She also emphasized the importance of participants having signed copies of their plans, especially to ensure that contracted providers are adhering to plans. She said that high levels of turnover among providers and peer workers make engagement and recovery challenging. She shared that she has sent multiple emails to the CARE email and has not gotten a response. She said she wants CARE to work but knows of cases in which plans are not being followed.
- Laurel Benhamida asked how RAND is ensuring that data is captured for participants who speak no or limited English and if the evaluation process is providing translation services for these participants. She said this was not addressed in their presentation.
- Labriola responded to Benhamida and said that translation services will be provided.

## 5. Meeting Wrap Up and Next Steps

**Karen Linkins** shared information on how to access various data resources. She shared the dates of the next CARE Act Working Group meeting and ad hoc meetings. She reminded the group that ad hocs do not meet on months when the CARE Act Working Group is meeting. She encouraged group members to share topic suggestions for future meetings via email. She thanked everyone for attending and adjourned the meeting.

## Appendix I: Public Zoom Chat

From John Freeman - DVC to Everyone:

If you are an ad hoc group member who has entered as an attendee, please raise your hand to be made a panelist.

From John Freeman - DVC to Everyone:

Information about this and other meetings is available on the CARE Act Working Group Site:  
<https://www.chhs.ca.gov/home/committees/care-act-working-group>

Email us at [CAREAct@chhs.ca.gov](mailto:CAREAct@chhs.ca.gov) to join the CARE listserv to receive updates and information on future stakeholder events.

From John Freeman - DVC to Everyone:

For reference, these slides are available at: <https://www.chhs.ca.gov/07102024-care-data-and-eval-meeting/>

From John Freeman - DVC to Everyone:

For reference, here are a few sites to keep in mind for additional information:

Training and Technical Assistance and other resources are available on the CARE Act Resource Center <https://care-act.org/>

CARE Act Working Group Site: <https://www.chhs.ca.gov/home/committees/care-act-working-group>

Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) CARE Act Website:  
<https://www.dhcs.ca.gov/Pages/CARE-ACT.aspx>

Judicial Council of California (JCC) CARE Act Website (court forms and more):  
<https://www.courts.ca.gov/48654.htm>

CalHHS CARE Act website: <https://www.chhs.ca.gov/care-act/>

Links to County and Court CARE sites: <https://care-act.org/library/county-website-directory/>