

# CLARK COUNTY MENTAL HEALTH SALES TAX FUNDING ADVISORY BOARD MEETING

## MINUTES OF MAY 22, 2018

The Clark County Mental Health Sales Tax Funding Advisory Board convened in BOC Training Room 679, Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. Chair Boldt, Councilor Jeanne Stewart, Bradley Alberts (District Court Deputy Administrator), Vanessa Gaston (Director, Community Services), Alan Melnick (Health Officer/Administrator, Public Health), Adriana Prata (Director, Budget Office), Judge James Rulli (Superior Court), DeDe Sieler (Community Services), Christine Simonsmeier (Administrator, Juvenile Court), Emily Zwetzig (Budget Office), Josh Urban (Budget Office).

8:00am.

### Minute Approval for April 26<sup>th</sup> Meeting

Chairman Boldt began with asking the Advisory Board for approval of the meeting minutes from the April 26<sup>th</sup> meeting. The Advisory Board approved.

### Stakeholder Group Meetings

Shauna McCloskey began with informing the Advisory Board about a smaller group made up of various stakeholders who meet to discuss more in depth, technical, aspects of the Mental Health Sales Tax. Shauna asked if this group should continue to meet with the creation of the Board and Chair Boldt and Director Prata agreed that they should. Members of the Board then discussed potential synergies between the two groups and established that moving forward more communication would be had.

### RFP Process Update

The Advisory Board then began to discuss how it would be evaluating submitted proposals and the distinction that would be made between internal and external requests for funding. Chair Boldt moved that these would be separate decisions for the group. Emily Zwetzig explained how to bring this method into alignment with the regular county budget process and what deadlines would apply. Vanessa Gaston clarified that internal proposals would still need to meet the mandatory criteria and the group expressed interest in making this process equitable for all applicants. Alan Melnick proposed that internal applicants still need to answer and provide two of the attachments of the RFP in their requests: Application Questions and the Budget Sheet. The group agreed. Adriana emphasized the budget deadlines that were approaching soon, due to legal requirements and County policy, and those internal requests would need to adhere to them. The Advisory Group ultimately decided that internal requests would be due by June 8<sup>th</sup>, and after decided on in the normal budget process, the RFP and available funding for external proposals would follow with a date not yet decided on.

### RFP Evaluation Criteria

The group then moved on to discuss the criteria that proposals would be scored on and how these parameters would be graded. The Advisory Board decided on the following:

#### **RFP Evaluation Criteria – Definitions**

##### **Evaluation – data, measures, stated outcomes (15 Points)**

- Demonstrate what the performance outcomes are, how many people will be served, how the data will be collected, and how outcomes will be measured.

**Experience and Qualification (15 Points)**

- Demonstrate that the applicant has a history in providing the program or service, show their compliance with any required certifications, experience with similar programs, and experience with population to be served and services to be provided.

**Evidence/Research-based, Innovative or Promising Practice(15 Points)**

- Demonstrate that the applicant has a history in providing the service or program.

**Population served/Need addressed (15 Points)**

- A strong application will clearly show data that there is an actual need for the service. Reference needs assessment for service/population

**Approach or Methodology (15 Points)**

- Does the proposed program clearly state its goals and objectives, including the educational level of the audience to be reached, the content to be conveyed, and the intended outcome? Is there evidence that the program is based on a sound rationale, as well as sound educational concepts and principles? Is the plan for evaluation sound and likely to provide information on the effectiveness of the program? If the proposed program will recruit participants, are the planned recruitment, retention, and follow-up (if applicable) activities adequate to ensure a highly qualified participant pool?
- Are the overall strategy, methodology, and analyses well-reasoned and appropriate to accomplish the specific aims of the project? Have the investigators presented strategies to ensure a robust and unbiased approach, as appropriate for the work proposed? Are potential problems, alternative strategies, and benchmarks for success presented? If the project is in the early stages of development, will the strategy establish feasibility and will particularly risky aspects be managed?
- Approach is casual while methodology is organized, scientific, and well researched.
- Approach becomes methodology when it has been time tested and proved its efficacy again and again.
- Methodology refers to procedures that have been tested time and again and proven to help overcome problems. It is a very well organized and well researched plan to solve a problem. Methodology is scientific in nature and can be executed in a series of small steps with the ability to be customized according to the requirements of a particular situation.

**Cost of Service/Leveraging of Funding (15 Points)**

- Is the budget reasonable? Is the cost reasonable compared to other similar proposals for the same type of services? Is it more or less?
- Does the applicant demonstrate ability to leverage other funding sources?
- What is the Return on Investment?
- How do they plan to sustain program/services. Is the proposal sustainable?
- Stability of organization.
- Program/Service is cost effective with outcomes.

**Collaboration with other entities (10 Points)**

- List of partners provided.
- Letters of support are important.

The Advisory Board adjourned at 9:00am