



**Maryland Consortium on Coordinated
Community Supports**

**Data Collection/Analysis &
Program Evaluation Subcommittee**

Larry Epp, Chair

January 19, 2023

Objectives for today's meeting

Review and refine three Data Subcommittee deliverables for first RFP:

1. Data applicants (Spokes) can use to demonstrate need
2. Role of data in evaluating grant proposals
3. Data grantees must collect and use to measure program effectiveness

Data Subcommittee Meeting Schedule

- TODAY: Thursday, January 19, 12:00 pm
- Thursday, January 26, 12:00 pm
- FULL CONSORTIUM: Tuesday, February 21, 9:30 am

Recap: First RFP

The first RFP will support BOTH capacity building AND service delivery.

FY 2023 applicants/grantees will include both:

- A. Hubs/Backbones:** Grant dollars support capacity building and technical assistance. Will be statewide – approximately one per jurisdiction.
- B. Spokes/Service providers:** Grant dollars support access to services. Must demonstrate need.

1. Data applicants (Spokes) can use to demonstrate need

Measure – school level	Source
ACEs	Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBS)
Socioeconomic need (free and reduced lunches)	School report card/list of Community schools
Limited English proficient students	MSDE/school report card
Substance use	Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBS)
Depression and Suicidality	Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBS)
Student homelessness counts	MSDE
Chronic absenteeism	MSDE/school report card
Number of uninsured children	ACS
Graduation rates	MSDE/school report card
Disciplinary incidents/violence	MSDE

1. Data applicants (Spokes) can use to demonstrate need

Measure – Jurisdiction level	Source
Behavioral health provider shortages	HRSA
Public Behavioral Health Service Use rate	BHA
Homicide rates (all ages)	
ACEs	Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance System (YRBS)
Number of students seen in Emergency Departments for overdoses and mental health incidents	CRISP/HSCRC
Number of justice-involved students	DJS annual report
Number of students experiencing BH crises	Crisis data?
Gaps in school mental health services	SHAPE system

2. Role of data in evaluating proposals

Support from the schools/LEAs is key.

Step one: Quality of proposal received. Six review criteria (may have different weight):

1. Competencies of applicant agencies
2. Program design and prospects for success
3. Engagement with families and communities
4. Ability to collaborate with partners
5. Ability to demonstrate measurable outcomes required by Consortium
6. Community need

Step two: Final selections will also consider:

1. Geographic balance
2. Alignment with other successful initiatives in the geographic region
3. Prioritization by schools/LEAs

3. Data grantees must collect to measure program effectiveness

Goals

1. Expand access to high-quality behavioral health and related services for students and families

2. Improve student wellbeing and readiness to learn

3. Foster positive classroom environments

4. Expand revenues from Medicaid and other funding sources for school behavioral health

Proposed Goal 1: Expand access to services

Data Grantees would collect (proposed)

1. Number of unduplicated individuals/families:
 - receiving universal supports
 - receiving screenings and early identification
 - receiving Tier 2/3 services
2. Number of Tier 2/3 service encounters (both school and Partnerships)
3. Number of schools and students where new Partnership supports and services are offered – Universal and Tier 2/3
4. Average wait time for identified students to access Tier 2/3 services
5. Perceived effectiveness of services – Tier 2/3
6. Improvements in the quality and array of supports and services (SHAPE system) – Universal and Tier 2/3

Proposed Goal 2: Student wellbeing and readiness to learn

Data Grantees would collect (proposed)

1. Number/percentage of individuals demonstrating improvements in social, emotional, behavioral, or academic functioning – Tier 2/3 *
2. Number/percentage of individuals receiving substance use services who demonstrate reduction in substance use – Tier 2/3

* Data definition will provide examples such as improvements in depression, suicidality, anxiety, etc.

Population data from other sources (proposed)

1. Overall student wellbeing (YRBS, Maryland School Survey)
2. YRBS substance use data, other OOCC data
3. Chronic absenteeism (MSDE)
4. Utilization of emergency services (CRISP/Medicaid claims)

Proposed Goal 3:

Positive classroom environments

Data Grantees would collect (proposed)

1. Increased use of positive classroom strategies
2. Improvements in school climate (SHAPE self-assessment Tier 1 quality domain)

Population data from other sources (proposed)

1. Academic outcomes (MSDE or MLDS)
2. Disciplinary data (MSDE) – Universal
3. Number of justice-involved students (DJS) – Universal
4. Perception of school safety (MD School Survey) – Universal
5. Staff satisfaction (MD School Survey) – Universal

Proposed Goal 4: Revenue from Medicaid and other sources

Data Grantees would collect (proposed)

1. Fee for Service Medicaid dollars leveraged – Tier 2/3
 - Community providers (EMR)
 - School staff?
2. Administrative Medicaid dollars leveraged
3. Private insurance dollars leveraged – Tier 2/3
 - Community providers (EMR)
 - School staff?
4. Dollars from other funding sources

Data from other sources (proposed)

1. Medicaid data (claims, other)

Possible future presentations

- **Substance Use Disorder programs**
- **Measuring risk** – Robert Balfanz
- **Data platforms** – Crystal Carr, Healthcare Initiative Foundation
- **Hub Data platforms** – Yuri Cartier
- **Youth Risk Behavioral Surveillance Survey**
- **Annie E. Casey** report researchers
- **Others??**