

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH
Mental Health Services Act Community Planning Team (BHSA CPT)

AGENDA	
DATE & LOCATION	LINK TO MEETING
Tuesday, March 11, 2025, 9:30-12:30 St. Anne’s Conference and Event Center 155 N. Occidental Blvd, Los Angeles 90026	Click Join the meeting now Meeting ID: 221 101 411 058 Passcode: Cq94iB3k Dial in by phone +1 323-776-6996,,255407060# Phone conference ID: 255 407 060#
OBJECTIVES	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Share Updates on MHSA-Related Administrative Items. 2. Discuss Additions to the MHSA Annual Update for FY 2025-26 for Innovations Projects for FSP Expansion, Club House Consultation, and Transitioning Prevention to Early Intervention. 3. Review and Affirm the BHSA Frameworks for the BHSA Community Program Planning Process.
TIME	ITEMS
9:30 – 9:45	I. SESSION OPENING <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Land and Labor Acknowledgements B. Announcements & Communication Expectations C. Agenda Review
9:45 – 10:00	II. UPDATES ON MHSA-RELATED ADMINISTRATIVE ITEMS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. <u>Update</u>: Kalene Gilbert, LCSW, Mental Health Program Manager IV, MHSA Administration & Oversight Division, LACDMH
10:00 – 11:00	III. MHSA ANNUAL UPDATE ADDITIONS: FSP, CLUB HOUSE, PREVENTION TRANSITION TO EARLY INTERVENTION <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. <u>Instructions (10 min)</u>: Review Consensus Building Process B. <u>Presentation (10 min)</u>: Kalene Gilbert, LACDMH C. <u>Discussion (40 min)</u>
10:50 – 11:00	IV. BREAK
11:10 – 12:25	V. REVIEW AND AFFIRM FRAMEWORKS FOR BHSA COMMUNITY PROGRAM PLANNING PROCESS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. <u>Review Proposals (15 min)</u>: Stakeholders, Engagement Agreements, CPP Roadmap, Member Information Form B. <u>Build Consensus (60 min)</u>
12:25 – 12:30	VI. CLOSING <ol style="list-style-type: none"> A. Next Steps & Meeting Evaluation
12:30	VII. ADJOURN

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH
Mental Health Services Act Community Planning Team (BHSA CPT)

WORKSHEET 1
ADDITIONS TO MHSA ANNUAL UPDATE

PROPOSAL

Designate funds in the MHSA Annual Update for FY 2025-26 for Innovations projects in three areas:

1. FSP Expansion
2. Club House Consultation
3. Transitioning Prevention Programs to Early Intervention Programs

FEEDBACK

1. What Questions of Clarification do you have?

2. What do you like about the proposal?

3. What concern(s) do you have?

4. What suggestion(s) do you have?

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH
Mental Health Services Act Community Planning Team (BHSA CPT)

CONSENSUS BUILDING

Over the past twenty years, Los Angeles County MHSA Stakeholders have consistently sought to build consensus among its members when issuing a recommendation on a given proposal. The consensus-building process has evolved over time, but it has generally followed five steps. The following table provides a high-level description of each step and describes the two methods that have been used to make a decision: ‘Full Agreement’ and ‘Super Majority Voting.’ The ‘Gradients of Agreement’ tool is presented after the table.

DESCRIPTION	EXAMPLE
<p>STEP 1: PROPOSAL PRESENTATION</p> <p>The process begins by presenting a proposal. Proposals typically come from a Workgroup, a CPT member, and/or a department staff member.</p>	<p>‘I propose an Innovation project to expand FSPs across all Service Areas.’</p>
<p>STEP 2: QUESTIONS OF CLARIFICATION</p> <p>Before asking CPT members to indicate if they agree or disagree with the proposal, we begin with Questions of Clarification. These questions are aimed at making sure everyone understands the proposal, before asking stakeholders to express their support or concerns. (Questions of Clarification are not intended to be disguised debates.)</p> <p>At the end of these questions, the group is polled using the ‘Gradients of Agreement’ tool (see below) to see where they’re at as a full group with regards to the proposal. Polling is not voting or a decision. It’s just a way to take a ‘temperature’ of the range of agreement.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do we need to expand FSPs? • How many \$ would be allocated for how many FSPs? • Which age populations would receive these FSPs? • How many new FSPs will reach Service Area X?
<p>STEP 3: DELIBERATION</p> <p>Deliberation begins by asking CPT members to share their support and/or their concerns with the proposal. During this time, members can propose <u>friendly amendments</u> to the person who presented the proposal (i.e., the proposer). All friendly amendments are put on a flip chart (or somewhere visible to the entire group). The proposer can choose to accept or not accept the friendly amendments.</p> <p>After all friendly amendments have been presented and accepted (or not accepted), we use the ‘Gradients of Agreement’ to test for Full Agreement for the proposal. <u>Full Agreement</u> is achieved when everyone lands on A, B, C, or D, and nobody is an E.</p>	<p>‘I am concerned the FSP expansion will not sufficiently address the needs of Service Area X. I propose allocating half of all new FSPs of the Innovation Project to serve Service Area X.’</p>

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH
Mental Health Services Act Community Planning Team (BHSA CPT)

DESCRIPTION	EXAMPLE
<p>STEP 4: ALTERNATIVE PROPOSALS</p> <p>If someone is an ‘E,’ that person is required to present an Alternative Proposal. Let’s say the proposer rejected the friendly amendment to allocate half of all new FSPs to serve Service Area X. The CPT member who proposed that friendly amendment now can present their proposal and explain why it’s important (i.e., Step 1). We then invite Questions of Clarification (Step 2), followed by Deliberation, ending by testing for agreement (Step 3). If nobody is an ‘E,’ this proposal has achieved <u>Full Agreement</u>. However, if someone is an ‘E’ on the Alternative Proposal, we move to Step 5: Voting among the Options.</p>	<p>‘I propose allocating half of all new FSPs of the Innovation Project to serve Service Area X.’</p>
<p>STEP 5: VOTING AMONG THE OPTIONS</p> <p>If Full Agreement is not achieved, stakeholder use <u>voting</u> as a method to determine if they agree with a proposal and use as a 60% standard threshold to determine if there’s enough support for proposal.</p> <p>No deliberation is allowed in Step 5, only questions of clarification about the process and the content to make sure everyone is clear about the options. CPT members vote on the first proposal, with friendly amendments. If 60% of CPT members present vote for this option, this concludes the process. If it does not garner 60% of the vote, CPT members then vote on the alternative proposal. If this one garners 60% of the votes, this concludes the process. If neither receives 60%, the proposal is not considered to have the support of the CPT.</p>	<p><u>Option 1:</u> An Innovation project to expand FSPs equally across Service Areas [plus other friendly amendments that have been accepted].</p> <p><u>Option 2:</u> Half of all new FSPs of the Innovation Project to serve Service Area X’</p>

GRADIENTS OF AGREEMENT¹

A	B	C	D	E
Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I strongly agree the proposal.	I agree the proposal, with minor items.	I don’t have an opinion on this proposal; but I can live with proposal.	I do not agree with the proposal; but I won’t oppose the proposal.	I cannot move forward with the proposal. But I propose the following...

¹ This version of the Gradients of Agreement is an adaptation of *Community At Work’s* Gradients of Agreement. See Sam Kaner, et al. (2014). *Facilitator’s Guide to Participatory Decision-Making, Third Edition*. (Jossey-Bass: San Francisco)

LOS ANGELES COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH
Mental Health Services Act Community Planning Team (BHSA CPT)