

December 15, 2004 Data Infrastructure Grant Regional Conference Calls:

Northeast Call at 11:00, Midwest/Southern Call at 2:00, and Western Call at 4:00 (EST)

The major agenda items for the calls:

- 1) Outcomes Workgroup (Steve Davis, Ok)
- 2) Functioning/Social Connectedness Measures Workgroup (Bernadette Phelan, AZ)
- 3) URS Reporting December 2004 (Ted Lutterman, NRI)
- 4) Report on URS Output Tables Workgroup (Ted Lutterman, NRI)
- 5) DIG Grant Management Issues (Olinda Gonzalez, CMHS)
- 6) Plans for the National DIG Meeting on February 8-9, 2004.

Steve Davis, (Oklahoma) reviewed the work of the URS/DIG Outcomes Workgroup and its testing plan:

- 1) The Workgroup has identified 2 questions on Adult Criminal Justice Contacts, 2 questions on Juvenile Justice Contacts, and several questions on school attendance. These questions are being pilot tested as additions to the MHSIP Consumer Surveys.
 - a) Copies of all the questions developed by the Outcomes Workgroup will be posted on the SDICC website.
 - b) Virginia has developed Spanish Language translations of the Criminal Justice questions. These will be posted on the SDICC website at: <http://www.nri-inc.org/SDICC/defsdicc.cfm>
- 2) Three states (SC, VA, and WI) have completed pilot testing these questions and are currently completing their analysis of the surveys. In addition to VA, WI, and SC, HI and SD will be turning in analyses based on questions they included in their consumer surveys.
- 3) The Outcomes Workgroup has developed a set of questions about the experiences of the states in pilot testing these questions. The 5 states and the Outcomes workgroup will analyze the results during January, with the goal of having final recommended questions by the February National DIG Meeting.
- 4) Several additional states indicated that they have used their consumer surveys to compile information about criminal justice contact or schools. These states are encouraged to contact the Outcomes Workgroup and contribute their experiences to the analysis.

Bernadette Phelan, (Arizona) reviewed the work of the Social Connectedness/Functioning Workgroup:

1. This workgroup has held several meetings with states about the 2 new SAMHSA Core Outcome Measures. The workgroup has surveyed its members about a number of potential survey items for measuring Social Connectedness and Functioning for both Children and Adults. The workgroup has now identified about 4 to 6 items for each of these areas that it will recommend that states pilot test.
2. The workgroup will be developing a testing plan that will lay out how they want each of these new survey items to be tested and what additional information states will be asked to collect as part of the testing plan. The questions for the functioning and social connectedness workgroup will be further refined, and the goal for completion will be in January.
 - a. The testing plan will be coordinated with the MHSIP work on the next generation consumer survey and the testing of Recovery measures.

3. The goal is to have a small set of measures that states will pilot test as part of their 2005 round of MHSIP and YSSF surveys for the URS reporting.
4. Several states expressed a concern that with the addition of the new Outcomes questions plus the Functioning and Social Connectedness questions that the MHSIP and YSSF will become too long and have low response rates.
 - a. The Workgroup will consider burden issues as it completes its recommendations.
 - b. The Workgroup will coordinate with the MHSIP Policy Group on the overall MHSIP survey redesign work.

Ted Lutterman, from the NRI's SDICC, Reviewed the URS December 1, 2004 Reporting

- 1) Most states submitted 2004 URS data tables electronically, either using the web-based reporting tool or using the Excel spreadsheets
 - a) Some states modified the excel spreadsheets to add new categories or re-order reporting cells. A set of standard macros have been developed to import the data from Excel into the URS database. When state's modify the reporting sheets, they risk having data incorrectly reported into the URS data system. States are encouraged to provide footnotes and explanations on the URS tables, but please don't modify the tables.
- 2) There are several tables that states are asking for additional guidance or a review of the reporting definitions. Ted reviewed some of the tables where the SDICC has received the most questions. The call participants identified additional issues:
 - a) Table 3a: The definition of homelessness, particularly for children
 - b) Table 6: Length of stay for continuing clients—some of whom may have been in the hospital for years
 - c) Table 9: Please provide better guidance on how to define rural and urban areas
 - d) Table 9: Some services need better definitions
 - e) Age Groups: Some of the Developmental Tables use different age groups than the other tables. A standardization of age groupings was requested
 - f) Are the Race categories final? Will OMB allow using "Other Race" for the URS? Some states report OMB is allowing Other Race reporting in other Federal reporting systems.
 - g) Since CMHS is adding new questions around Functioning and Social Connectedness, will they consider dropping some URS tables that are not related to the SAMHSA Core Outcome Measures and that are not of high priority?
- 3) A new workgroup will be developed to review these items and provide guidance on the 2005 URS Reporting Tables. States are encouraged to send any additional areas they want this workgroup to review.

Ted Lutterman presented on the new DIG Output Reports Workgroup

The workgroup had its first conference call to review the existing URS Output Reports and developing new Output Reports useful to states. The workgroup includes state planners, state MIS staff, and several state Planning Council representatives.

1. The Planning Council representatives indicated that they liked the URS tables, but there are too many pages and too much detail. They would like to see much shorter reports. Several Planning Council members agreed to review the tables and send their prioritizations on what short set of tables they would like to see.

2. The workgroup discussed the existing output tables and recommended keeping the basic structure. Additional comparison groups (beyond the state and national averages were discussed.
 - a. For consumer survey results: showing results by type of survey sample, by survey used, etc.
 - b. For EBPs reporting by states measuring fidelity
 - c. Allowing states to pick special regional or comparison groups.
3. In addition to the paper reports, the states are interested in being able to access the data on a database where they can select comparison groups. For example:
 - a. States with similar rural/urban populations
 - b. States with similar income levels
 - c. States with similar population size
 - d. States with similar managed care systems, etc.

The NRI will explore with the workgroup further they types of comparisons they are interested in and the potential for putting such a query system on the web.

4. The NRI will collect from states examples of output reports that the states have produced that use URS data or similar data to share results within the state. If states send copies of their reports, the NRI will share them with other states via the website.

Dr. Gonzalez, CMHS reviewed several issues related to the management of the DIGs.

1. States were reminded that if their terms of participation on their grant award, that they need to respond to these terms.
2. Review comments from the DIG applications are available to the states. Since the review comments are confidential—only the people connected with the grant can receive these comments.

National DIG Meeting: Baltimore, Maryland, February 8-9, 2004

Dr. Gonzalez discussed the National DIG Meeting to be held on Tuesday, February 8 and 9, 2004 in Baltimore, Md. Each states is expected to use some of their DIG grant resources to cover the costs of a state MH planner and state data person to attend the DIG meeting. The National DIG meeting will start at 1:00 on Tuesday, February 8, 2004 and will immediately follow the NRI's 15th Annual Conference on State Mental Health Agency Services Research. This year's NRI Conference will focus on three major themes: (1) Recovery, (2) Evidence-based Practices, and (3) Co-occurring mental health and substance abuse services. Copies of the agenda for the NRI conference are available at: www.nri-inc.org. CMHS has indicated that states will be able to use their DIG Grant resources to cover the hotel costs for the additional nights of the NRI conference.

5) Next DIG Regional Calls

- a) Northeast: Thursday, 01/27/04 at 11:00 Eastern
- b) Midwest/Southern: Thursday: 01/27/04 at 2:00 Eastern
- c) West/Territories: Thursday: 01/27/04 at 4:00 Eastern