

**April 19, 2007 Data Infrastructure Grant Regional Conference Calls:**  
*Northeast Call at 11:00, Midwest/Southern Call at 2:00 and Western Call at 4:00 (EDT)*

**The major agenda items for the calls:**

1. New DIG Grant Announcement questions and answers:
2. Report on URS/DIG Workgroups: Bernadette Phelan, SDICC/NRI
  - a. T1-T2 Change Measures Workgroup:
  - b. Survey Validation Workgroup
3. Issues related to the December 1, 2006 URS Reporting: Ted Lutterman, SDICC/NRI
4. DIG Supplements for BRFSS Surveys: Olinda Gonzalez, CMHS

1. CMHS staff answered questions from states about the RFA for a new 3 year cycle of Data Infrastructure Grants (DIGs).

Roger George from the SAMHSA Grants Management participated on two (2) of the regional calls to answer questions from states about technical aspects of their grant applications. Roger can be reached at (240) 276-1418 or at [roger.george@samhsa.hhs.gov](mailto:roger.george@samhsa.hhs.gov) for any further questions.

Mr. George pointed out the requirement that even states who electronically submit grant applications will need to mail in the appropriate signature documents.

Dr. Gonzalez reviewed some common questions. RFA sections B and D have some duplication. States should address common areas in their responses to both sections B and D (do not simply reference an earlier response in the prior section).

Some of the questions raised during the call include:

**On form SF-424,**

**What is the # 4, applicant identifier number? Actually this field is considered the same as 5b. So you can leave this section blank.**

**What is 5a, Fed Entity Identifier (same as EIN?) You can also leave this section blank.**

**What is 5b, Fed Award identifier? You would input your SAMHSA federal grant #, (for example 5 H79 SM12345), if you were not assigned a SAMHSA grant #, then leave this section blank.**

**The CFDA title seems to be pre-populated....just leave it? That's fine**

**What is # 13 competition identification numbers? This would be your Announcement #, which you can get from the RFA, (e.g., SM-07-012)**

**What is title? (Following #13 comp. id numbers). This would be the name of the Announcement, (e.g., Mental Health Data Infrastructure Grants for Quality Improvement (Short Title: State DIG), if space is an issue, just use the short title.**

**Would the table of contents and abstract be attachments to Form 424? Yes or the Program Narrative.**

**Our address Country seems to be USA (8d), should I just leave it like that? You would input the address of the Grantee Organization. Country would be USA: United States.**

**We can't put the title of the signatory (our Minister of Health) on the non-construction assurances form even though the space is colored yellow. If you are unable to enter the title, make sure that his signature and date appears in the appropriate section on that page.**

**DUNS # : You can obtain a DUNS # from Duns & Bradstreet by calling (1-866-705-5711).**

2. DIG WORKGROUP REPORTS: Dr. Phelan, SDICC reported:

Validation Workgroup: Criminal Justice Involvement

The criminal justice WG met, as scheduled, on April 17. The WG reviewed Oklahoma's and Wisconsin's data. In both states, the surveys were matched with the administrative data set. It is important to note that these two states differ in terms of what comprised their administrative data sets. Oklahoma's administrative data set comes from the OK Bureau of Investigation while Wisconsin's administrative data comes from a bi-annual reporting of the outcome (arrest) data by the case manager.

Overall, the WG made the following observations:

1. rate of agreement between the two data sets (survey and administrative) in both states is high among those who reported 'no arrest'
2. rate of agreement between the two data sets in both states remains inconclusive for those with arrest due to the very small number of cases left after matching and filtering out those with incomplete arrest information. Therefore, more iteration in data analysis is needed. The WG recommended the following additional analysis: (a) telescoping of the population by looking at a 2-year arrest data; (b) relaxing the study requirement for case inclusion in the study; and (c) closer examination of the arrest report of non-survey respondents.
3. Clients with one or more years of service who reported to have been arrested in the past 12 months showed comparable arrest rates for Oklahoma on both data sets but not for Wisconsin where the arrest rate from the survey is higher.

The WG will continue to meet and report the preliminary results in May.

## Validation Workgroup: Improved Functioning

The Validation WG discussion reviewed South Carolina's data on improved functioning right after the meeting on criminal justice. South Carolina's data is being examined at the aggregate level (meaning, surveys were not matched to the person's recorded GAF scores).

Data on the percent of clients reporting in the survey that their functioning has improved and the percent of clients showing improved functioning based on the administration of a standardized functioning assessment tool was reported by Mental Health Center in order to see if location may be a factor for the rate differential.

Overall, the WG made the following observations:

1. rates of improved functioning vary greatly across Centers;
2. rates of improved functioning based on the survey data tend to be higher than the rate using administrative data across centers

The need for more states to participate in this analysis became apparent. David Menefee from Colorado agreed to participate and will analyze Colorado's data using CCAR as the assessment instrument.

The WG will continue to meet and report the preliminary findings in May.

## T1 and T2 Change Measure:

The SDICC staff continues to work on the computer program. SDICC staff is getting ready to test run the program on the state data submitted to NRI for analysis. There is no scheduled meeting of the WG.

### **3. 2006 URS Output Tables: Lutterman:**

In March, the NRI SDICC sent out each state copies of the 2006 URS Output Reports for their final review. Two sets of tables were sent to each state: (1) the single year reports with detailed tables for each URS Tables, and (2) Multi-year Reports that show URS data for the last 4 years for many URS Tables. States are asked to complete their review and send any corrections or additional data by April 13, 2007. States also have an opportunity to submit additional footnotes or comments about their tables. Most states have responded, but a few states are still reviewing the data or sending in revised data. States are encouraged to finalize their review of the tables in the next couple of weeks. Even if your state has no changes to make, please then notify the SDICC that your data is "okay".

### **4. 2007 URS Reporting Issues:**

#### **Reporting Stratified Survey Results with over-sampling:**

A question arose about the reporting of consumer survey results (URS Tables 9, 11, and 19) when a state conducts a stratified random sample that over-samples providers or particular client groups. For example, one state is over-sampling minorities in their state to assure that they can have statistically significant results about various minorities' perceptions of outcomes. The question arose, should the state report to the URS the total number of survey responses (that are over-weighted to minorities) or should they re-weight their results and report adjusted totals.

This issue was addressed last Fall by the DIG Consumer Survey workgroup. Their recommendation was that adjusted results should be reported that re-weight over-sampled groups back to their appropriate state level. Several states on the DIG regional calls suggested that a brief technical paper that provides examples of how states have over-sampled and then re-weighted their results would be helpful. The SDICC will work with CMHS to determine if such a technical paper can be prepared for the states.

### **Calculating the Functional Improvement Score from the MHSIP Survey Modules:**

Last year, 4 new items were recommended as a new module to be added to the Adult MHSIP survey for states to report a Functioning Improvement Score (for states who do not have an existing measure using a standardized functioning instrument). The scoring of the Functioning Improvement measure reported on URS Table 9 is detailed in the Table 9 instructions. The Functional Improvement score uses the 4 new Functioning Questions, plus 1 item existing MHSIP Survey Outcome item.

**Adult Improved Functioning:** *(answered as: Strongly Agree, Agree, Neutral/Undecided, Disagree, Strongly Disagree)*

*As a result of the services I received ...*

1. I do things that are more meaningful to me.
2. I am better able to take care of my needs.
3. I am better able to handle things when they go wrong.
4. I am better able to do things that I want to do.
5. My Symptoms are not bothering me as much *(this question already is part of the MHSIP Adult Survey)*

Because the DIG Workgroup was directed not to change the scoring of the original MHSIP Survey Outcomes Domain, the scoring of the Outcomes domain remains the same as it was prior to the addition of the 4 new functioning questions. Thus, the item: "My Symptoms are not bothering me as much" is used in the calculation of both the Outcomes Score and the Functioning Score.

**Children's Functioning Measure:** Because the YSS-F (the Parent/Care Giver survey for children's mental health) already had many more functioning related items used in its calculation of its Outcomes Domain, the pilot work on the Functioning Measure for children resulted in only 1 new item being added to the YSS-F: "My child is better able to do things he or she wants to do." As a result, the YSS-F Functioning measure uses 5 items that are also used in the YSS-F Outcome domain calculation:

*As a result of the services my child received ...*

1. My child is better able to do things he or she wants to do. *(new item)*
2. My child is better at handling daily life. *(existing YSS-F Survey item)*
3. My child gets along better with family members. *(existing YSS-F Survey item)*
4. My child gets along better with friends and other people. *(existing YSS-F Survey item)*
5. My child is doing better in school and/or work. *(existing YSS-F Survey item)*
6. My child is better able to cope when things go wrong. *(existing YSS-F Survey item)*

## **5. Evidence Based Practices (EBP) Workgroup:**

A question was raised by a state in the Northeast Region about EBP reporting. If their state does not support a particular EBP (e.g., the state does not have any special funding for it, provide training for it, and hasn't officially adopted the EBP), does the state need to report the EBP. For example, the state may not be supporting an EBP, but 1 or 2 providers may have decided on their own to supply the EBP. In this case, does the SMHA need to track and report on the EBP to the URS? The current recommendation is that if a state doesn't support an EBP, it need not track the provision of the EBP. The EBP Workgroup will be asked to provide additional clarification...

## **6. BRFSS K-6 and Stigma Module Workshop:**

The SDICC is working closely with CMHS on a workshop that will assist states to better understand the BRFSS Mental Health and Stigma Module. The module has been funded for implementation this year in 35 states. This one-day workshop, which most likely will happen in the month of September (either Sept. 10<sup>th</sup> or 17<sup>th</sup>), will provide:

- a) information on recent research work and issues related to the prevalence of mental illness and stigma, including a review of the SMI definition;
- b) historical perspective in the development of the K-6 and stigma module; and
- c) basic understanding of the BRFSS module data.

The SDICC can sponsor only 1 representative per state. So far, SDICC contacted only the 20 states with DIG supplemental grant to conduct the analysis for this module. Funds to support participation in the workshop will be available from the SDICC for the other 15 states who are implementing this module. You may express your interest by e-mailing us (Ted or Bernadette). Please let us know if you plan to send more than one person. The state will be responsible in finding the funds to support the additional person.

## **7. Next DIG Regional Calls**

The next round of Regional Calls will be held on Thursday, May 22 at 11:00 EST for the Eastern Region, at 2:00 EST for the South/Midwest Region and 4:00 EST for the Western Region.