

**CPAW AGENDA ITEM
READINESS WORKSHEET**

CPAW Meeting Date: Oct 4th, 2012

Name of Committee: Planning Committee

1. Agenda Item Name: Proportion of CPAW members who are Clients/Consumers and Family Members.

2. Desired Outcome

Approve CPAW Recommendation to Executive Team

3. Summary:

The Planning Committee recommends that the MHS Design Team's Recommendation #1 be put forward to the Executive Team as it was written, and that CPAW develop an agreed upon internal definition of Clients/Consumers and of Family Members. (Providers and peer providers may also need clarified definitions, but are not mentioned in this recommendation)

4. Background:

At CPAW's request, the Planning Committee (and one additional CPAW member) reviewed the input and comments made by CPAW members regarding the Design Team's first recommendation. The majority (over 70%) of CPAW members who responded to the survey were willing to accept this recommendation as it stood. An additional 24% supported the recommendation but had comments and suggestions. However, only one of those comments directly addressed this recommendation. The remaining comments/suggestions spoke to the second recommendation (and were grouped accordingly) or expressed implementation suggestions, which were recorded and will be considered if this recommendation is approved. Given that 94% were able to support the recommendation, Planning Committee members propose moving it forward as written.

Throughout the survey, comments emphasized the importance of clearly defining clients/consumers and family members. This will be an important component of implementing this and other recommendations, therefore the Planning committee also recommends that CPAW reach agreement internally about those definitions.

Recommendation 1: The MHS Design Team recommends that at least 51% of CPAW stakeholders be Clients/Consumers and Family Members.

Support recommendation as it stands:	70.6%	(12)
Support recommendation with modifications/considerations:	23.5%	(4)
Do not support recommendation:	5.9%	(1)

Proposed new language:

Revised Recommendation 1: At least 51% of CPAW stakeholders be Clients/Consumers and Family Members.

5. Funding Considerations: None

7. CPAW Role:

Recommend- to the MH Director, or other bodies (Executive Team)

8. Other Important Factors:

Who else is influencing this item?

MHSA Design Team made the original recommendation. The Executive Team has requested a single set of recommendations be made that combines the input of CPAW and the recommendations of the MHSA Design Team. The Executive Team will approve the final recommendation brought forward by CPAW.

Is there an upcoming deadline?

No explicit deadline.

Is "Conflict of Interest" a factor that should be acknowledged with this item?

The current CPAW membership is being asked to design and approve its own composition. Some members may perceive a gain or loss accordingly.

9. Anticipated Time Needed on Agenda: 15 minutes

10. Who will report on this item? Steve Grolnic-McClurg

**CPAW AGENDA ITEM
READINESS WORKSHEET**

CPAW Meeting Date: Oct 4th, 2012

Name of Committee: Planning Committee

1. Agenda Item Name: Establishment of a Youth Council

2. Desired Outcome

Approve CPAW Recommendation to Executive Team

3. Summary:

The Planning Committee recommends that the MHSA Design Team's Recommendation #8 be put forward to the Executive Team with modifications (see Background).

4. Background:

The Design Team's original Recommendation 8 had two parts: (a) establish a Youth Council to gain the perspective of youth and their parents and to encourage their participation; and (b) change the time of the CPAW meeting to make it accessible to youth and their parents.

The Planning Committee reviewed the survey input and comments and noted substantial alignment on part (a): the concept of a Youth Council (all but one respondent in favor), with differing views on part (b): the issue of changing the time of the CPAW meeting. Since the time of CPAW's meeting is an internal implementation decision and not something the Planning Committee anticipated needing the Executive Team to approve, they considered only part (a) of this recommendation.

There were also some differing views about the following issues, which will be discussed if/when a Youth Council is implemented: (a) whether and how to involve parents of youth; and (b) if focus of youth/parent input is contained to CPAW or is broader.

After reviewing CPAW input relative to the establishment of a Youth Council, the Planning Committee proposed this modification:

Original recommendation and CPAW support:

Recommendation 8: In order to increase and encourage the participation of youth and the voice of parents of youth the MHSA Design Team makes the following recommendations: (a) establish a Youth Council to provide the perspective and input of youth in MHSA Programs and services, and (b) move CPAW meeting times to accommodate the participation of parents of children while they are in school.

Support recommendation as it stands:	43.8%	(7)
Support recommendation with modifications/considerations:	50.0%	(8)
Do not support recommendation:	6.3%	(1)

Proposed new language:

Revised Recommendation 8: Establish a Youth Council to provide the perspective and input of youth.



5. Funding Considerations: Staff and CPAW member time will be required to outreach to and engage potential Youth Council members; staff time will be required to plan and lead meetings.

7. CPAW Role:

Recommend- to the MH Director, or other bodies (Executive Team)

8. Other Important Factors:

Who else is influencing this item?

MHSA Design Team made the original recommendation. The Executive Team has requested a single set of recommendations be made that combines the input of CPAW and the recommendations of the MHSA Design Team. The Executive Team will approve the final recommendation brought forward by CPAW.

Is there an upcoming deadline?

No explicit deadline.

Is "Conflict of Interest" a factor that should be acknowledged with this item?

None anticipated.

9. Anticipated Time Needed on Agenda: 10 minutes

10. Who will report on this item? Mariana Moore

**CPAW AGENDA ITEM
READINESS WORKSHEET**

CPAW Meeting Date: Oct 4th, 2012

Name of Committee: Planning Committee

1. Agenda Item Name: Engagement of Mental Health Clients/Consumers with Co-Occurring Disorders

2. Desired Outcome

Approve CPAW Recommendation to Executive Team

3. Summary:

The Planning Committee recommends that the MHSA Design Team's Recommendation #10 be put forward to the Executive Team with a single modification (see Background).

4. Background:

The Design Team's Recommendation 10 was largely supported as written by survey respondents (76%), and by another more than 17% with a single clarification, for a total of 94% support. All of the comments made emphasized that MHSA regulations require that programs serve those with mental illness, and that therefore all Clients/Consumers engaged as stakeholders of CPAW must also have lived experience with mental illness, regardless of their experience with substance abuse or homelessness. While the original language of Recommendation 10 did acknowledge this, the repeated emphasis by CPAW members led the Planning Committee to strengthen that language in a slightly modified recommendation.

Original recommendation and CPAW support:

Recommendation 10: The MHSA Design Team recommends that Consumers/Clients with complex histories of mental illness and co-occurring disorders (both AOD and health) who may have experienced homelessness be encouraged to apply as CPAW members.

Support recommendation as it stands:	76.5%	(13)
Support recommendation with modifications/considerations:	17.6%	(3)
Do not support recommendation:	5.9%	(1)

Proposed new language:

Revised Recommendation 10: Mental Health Consumers/Clients with complex histories of mental illness and co-occurring disorders (both AOD and health) who may have experienced homelessness should be encouraged to apply as CPAW members.

5. Funding Considerations: Staff and CPAW member time may be required to outreach to and engage potential new members with complex needs and/or co-occurring disorders.

6. CPAW Role:

Recommend- to the MH Director, or other bodies (Executive Team)

7. Other Important Factors:

Who else is influencing this item?

MHSA Design Team made the original recommendation. The Executive Team has requested a single set of recommendations be made that combines the input of CPAW and the recommendations of the MHSA Design Team. The Executive Team will approve the final recommendation brought forward by CPAW.

Is there an upcoming deadline?

No explicit deadline.

Is "Conflict of Interest" a factor that should be acknowledged with this item?

None anticipated.

8. Anticipated Time Needed on Agenda: 10 minutes

9. Who will report on this item? Molly Hamaker

**CPAW AGENDA ITEM
READINESS WORKSHEET**

CPAW Meeting Date: Oct 4th, 2012

Name of Committee: Planning Committee

1. Agenda Item Name: Ensuring the Diversity of CPAW

2. Desired Outcome

Approve CPAW Recommendation to Executive Team

3. Summary:

The Planning Committee recommends that the MHSA Design Team's Recommendation #11 be put forward to the Executive Team with a modification (see Background).

4. Background:

82.4% of CPAW members who responded to the survey supported this recommendation as written. The comments made expressed concern about the details of the implementation challenges. Because these challenges will be addressed if/when the recommendation is implemented and do not need to be included in the high-level recommendation to the Executive Team, the Planning Committee proposes modified language to afford CPAW the flexibility to define during implementation how it will manage those details (which cultures and groups to account for, how to make that decision, what constitutes a good faith effort, etc). It was also noted by committee members that this recommendation expresses a desired goal and aspiration as opposed to a specific required percentage.

Original recommendation and CPAW support:

Recommendation 11: The MHSA Design Team recommends that every effort be made to balance the ethnic and cultural composition of CPAW as well as the regional representation of the county.

Support recommendation as it stands:	82.4%	(14)
Support recommendation with modifications/considerations:	11.8%	(2)
Do not support recommendation:	5.9%	(1)

Proposed new language:

Revised Recommendation 11: Every effort should be made to ensure the diversity of CPAW is representative of the diversity of Contra Costa County.

5. Funding Considerations: Staff and CPAW member time would be required to outreach to and recruit new members to fulfill missing roles; Staff time would be required to monitor and track alignment of membership with county demographics.

7. CPAW Role:

Recommend- to the MH Director, or other bodies (Executive Team)

8. Other Important Factors:

Who else is influencing this item?

MHSA Design Team made the original recommendation. The Executive Team has requested a single set of recommendations be made that combines the input of CPAW and the recommendations of the MHSA Design Team. The Executive Team will approve the final recommendation brought forward by CPAW.

Is there an upcoming deadline?

No explicit deadline.

Is "Conflict of Interest" a factor that should be acknowledged with this item?

None anticipated.

9. Anticipated Time Needed on Agenda: 10 minutes

10. Who will report on this item? Tom Gilbert