

## **March 21, 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. Report on URS/DIG Workgroups: Bernadette Phelan, SDICC/NRI
  - a. T1-T2 Change Measures Workgroup:
  - b. Survey Validation Workgroup
2. Issues related to the December 1, 2006 URS Reporting: Ted Lutterman, SDICC/NRI
3. DIG Supplements for BRFSS Surveys: Olinda Gonzalez, CMHS
4. New RFA for DIG Grants: Olinda Gonzalez, CMHS

### 1. DIG WORKGROUP REPORTS:

#### **a. Employment (T1 and T2) WG:**

NRI received employment data files from 5 states (FL, KS, OK, DE, DC) and 2 states (CT, VT) are working with us in analyzing their own data. We are expecting 2 more states to join in the data analysis (OH, GA).

To recap, this WG is looking into the appropriate time interval in which change in employment is best measured. The recommendation of the WG will be guided by the analysis on the pattern of employment of people with mental illness (how long do they stay employed or unemployed), the factors influencing employment outcome, and the availability of state employment data.

Update: NRI is currently developing an SPSS-based computer program that will be used for consistent analysis of the data files. The timeline is to complete the program this week, test it next week, and apply it to the data files. We hope to have something for the WG to discuss some time in April.

#### **b. Criminal Justice Involvement Validation WG:**

WG met on February 27 to review the preliminary analysis conducted on Oklahoma's criminal justice data. Looking at the various parameters to test validity of the rates derived using survey versus administrative data, there seems to be a correlation between the two rates. However, when looking at the number of observations on the various quadrants of a 2 x 2 table that we are using in the analysis, the relationship seems to be weak. WG recommended that further analysis be conducted.

To recap, this WG is validating the measure (criminal justice involvement by persons with mental illness) by comparing the rates derived using the consumer survey questions as opposed to the rates derived using the administrative data set (which may be collected in various ways: linking with other agency data set or report by case manager).

Comparability of the two rates would give us a reason to assume that the measure can be reported using either one of the two data sources.

Update: The WG is scheduled to meet on April 17 to look at further analysis on the OK data and also to review Wisconsin's data (first time). The WG needs greater participation from states particularly those with data that can be used in the analysis. I will be approaching some states that we have identified might have the data and invite them to participate.

**c. Improved Functioning Validation WG:**

WG met on March 7 to review the preliminary analysis conducted using South Carolina's data on improved functioning. SC's survey cannot be linked back to their administrative data set and so validation of the rates at the aggregate level was conducted. The analysis showed a difference in rates using the survey data versus that of administrative data (SC is using GAF score and improved functioning for this exercise is defined as 1 percentage point difference between two GAF scores of the individual). The analysis also showed that when the improved functioning domain score is compared against the outcome domain score of the survey, they showed proximity in values (only about 2 percentage point difference). The WG requested for further analysis of the data to make it approximate the population surveyed.

To recap, the WG is interested in validating the rates derived using the consumer survey questions as opposed to the rates derived using the administrative data set (collected through the use of a standardized instrument). The WG recognizes that several other factors may come into play in the analysis (such as the sensitivity and reliability of the instrument) and those are being considered when discussing the results of the analysis.

Update: The WG is scheduled to meet on April 17 to look at further analysis on the SC data. The WG needs greater participation from states particularly those with data that can be used in the analysis. I will be approaching some states that we have identified might have the data and invite them to participate.

**2. December 1, 2006 URS Reporting: Lutterman:**

Last week, the NRI SDICC sent out copies of the 2006 URS Output Reports to each state 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.

A potential new Output Table was discussed that would use data from URS Reporting Table 14: Children with SED and Adults with SMI Served along with data from the SAMHSA SED and SMI Prevalence Estimates. The proposed new table would calculate what percentage of each state's estimated SMI and SED populations were receiving services from the SMHA. State

representatives on the call expressed an interest in seeing such a table, so the SDICC committed to prepare a draft version of the table for states to review.

3. **Refining the Definition of Admissions:** During the Western Regional Call, an issue was raised about the definition of an Admission on URS Table 6 in community services. There was agreement during the call that the definition and guidance about how to define an admission in the community needed more clarification. The current Table 6 says “[Admissions] are all additions or new admissions during the reporting period. If a person has multiple admissions during that reporting period, all admissions will be counted.” The group discussed some potential variations in what is reported:
  - If a person is transferred from one community provider to another, is that an admission?
  - If a person is discharged from one provider, and starts services 1 or 2 days later at another provider, is that an admission?
  - If a person doesn’t come in for services for several months (but is never discharged), when they return to services are they counted as an admission? What if they return after 90 days or after 180 days or more?

The Western Region recommended that a workgroup be convened by conference call to explore how to clarify what should be reported by states as admissions. Hawaii and New Mexico volunteered to participate. Interested persons from other regions are encouraged to join this group.

4. **Evidence Based Practices (EBP) Workgroup:** A question was raised by a state in the Northeast Region about how much of an EBP needs to be offered before it is reported by the State. If an individual provider or 2 elects to start offering an EBP service, but the SMHA is not supporting this service, does the state have to report on it? If an EBP is only offered by one program in a large state, should that be counted? These questions will be referred to the EBP workgroup for a response.
5. **BRFSS Modules:** Olinda reported that 15 state representatives will be attending the CDC’s annual BRFSS conference next week (March 24–28, 2007) in Decatur, GA. There will be several workshops on analyzing BRFSS data and several presentations focusing on the new PHQ-8 (depression and anxiety) module added to the BRFSS in 2006.
6. **New Data Infrastructure Grant Announcement:** Olinda reviewed several questions that have been raised by states about the RFA.
  - a. Can we use 424A Form found on the SAMHSA website?  
The 424A Form found via the [samhsa.gov](http://samhsa.gov) website ([samhsa.gov](http://samhsa.gov), grants, new grants, Mental Health Data Infrastructure Grants for Quality Improvement SM 07-012, is the correct form, even though the edition date is 1997. You may use the form for application.

- b. How do we use Appendix E, Confidentiality and Participant Protection?

On Confidentiality and Participant Protection, page 18 and 19, you need to complete **each** major “bullet” listed, and if NA, indicate Not Applicable, with

reasons why the content for the section is not applicable. Appendix E is a detailed listing which is to be used to assist you (as a reference) in completing the bullets on page 18 and 19.

c. Who should the Letters of Support be addressed to?

They should be addressed to the DIG Principal Investigator or a state person designated as the appropriate person in a respective state. Letters should not be addressed to the SAMHSA Administrator or the CMHS Director.

**7. Next DIG Regional Calls**

The next round of Regional Calls will be held on Thursday, April 19 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.