

## **MHSF Office of Coordinated Care Recommendations (Draft for January 25<sup>th</sup> 2022 meeting)**

**First Discussion Group participants (11/22/21):** Chair Monique LeSarre, Kara Chien, Vitka Eisen, Andrea Salinas

**Second Discussion Group Participants (1/24/22)** Scott Arai, Kara Chien, Vitka Eisen

### **Foundational Resources for Recommendation Development**

#### **Mental Health SF Administrative code:**

*Mental Health San Francisco (MHSF), created through legislation (File No. 191148), identifies an Office of Coordinated Care on Page 12, lines 24-25 & Page 13 1-6: (2) Part Two: Establishment of the Office of Coordinated Care.*

*The 25 Department shall operate an Office of Coordinated Care to oversee the seamless delivery of mental health care and substance use services across the City's behavioral health systems, and to ensure that Mental Health SF is accountable and proactive in how it delivers care. The Office of Coordinated Care shall seek to ensure that services are provided to Mental Health SF participants in the most efficient and cost-effective way and shall minimize unnecessary bureaucracy. The Office of 5 Coordinated Care shall be staffed by City employees. The Office of Coordinated Care shall perform 6 the following functions (summarized below):*

- A. *Real-time Inventory of Program and Service Availability.*
- B. *Case Management and Navigation Services to Ensure a Continuum of Care*
- C. *Coordination with Psychiatric Emergency Services and Jail Health Services*
- D. *Data Collection*
- E. *Authorized Disclosures*
- F. *Marketing and Community Outreach.*

**IWG meeting discussions August-October 2021:** see recordings on [IWG website](#)

**IWG meeting recommendation brainstorm on November 9, 2021:** During the November meeting, the IWG brainstormed potential recommendations for the Office of Coordinated Care (see [November meeting minutes](#))

#### **Principles group applied to all recommendations (from the IWG principles)**

For each recommendation, ask, "does this recommendation..."

1. Reflect evidence and/or community based best practices, data, research, and a comprehensive needs assessment.
2. Prioritize mental health and/or substance use services for people in crisis.
3. Provide timely and easy access to mental health and substance use treatment (low barriers to services).
4. Create welcoming, nonjudgmental, and equity- driven treatment programs/spaces where all individuals are treated with dignity and respect.
5. Utilize a harm reduction approach in all services. (*Harm reduction is a public health philosophy, which promotes methods of reducing the physical, social, emotional, and economic*

harms associated with drug and alcohol use and other harmful behaviors on individuals and their community. Mental Health SF shall treat all consumers with dignity and compassion, and shall provide care without judgment, coercion, discrimination, or a requirement that clients consumers stop engaging in specific behaviors as a precondition to receiving care.)

6. Maintain an adequate level of free and low-cost medical substance use services and residential treatment slots, commensurate with the demand for such services.

7. Facilitate the integration of mental health and substance use services to ensure that individuals experience treatment as one seamless and completely coordinated system of care, organized around their individual needs.

**Discussion Group Recommendations**

Overarching care-standards that need to be considered in all the recommendations suggested in this document:

- Coordinated care recommendations need to address both physical and virtual environments
- Recommendations need to consider accessibility beyond what various health insurance covers
- All recommendations address the need for greater care coordination to identify and prevent clients from falling into “gaps” in their healing process before becoming stable.
- Transition periods between care providers should be covered, no one is discarded without a care plan.

**Commented [JJ1]:** Overall: need a space for larger level policy recommendations. This includes feedback about funding beyond the 23 hours, and other larger-frame issues.

**Commented [JJ2]:** Consider an oversight committee to ensure the services are delivered in a smooth, efficient productive way

**1-One case manager for one client across systems (DPH, BHS, HSA, HSH, etc.)**

Currently there are too many entities (probation, hospital, BHS, HSH) that do not communicate well with each other. We recommend the OCC follows clients from touchpoint to touchpoint to coordinate care. This role is not another case management project, but a **connector** role of mapping and oversight to keep track of people and their progress. This connector/care coordinator role will convene team meetings by bringing together all people engaged in their client’s healing to facilitate a collaborative decision-making effort in navigation and accountability for the services provided and the treatment results. This organized collaborative effort does not take the place of the community work provided by different agencies and organizations; rather, it links them together. This can enhance accountability and provide oversight to make sure treatment is being delivered as one person is touching upon multiple systems for each client.

**Commented [JJ3]:** Consider a visual system map oriented to the continuum of care to identify services/gaps/etc.

**Commented [JJ4]:** EMS, HSH. 911= OCC should play a coordinated role between these different entities and may need some legislative muscle to make this happen.

The OCC should have the authority to convene care coordination efforts across each of the city departments.

The OCC should be responsible for establishing after-hours response for emergency care coordination.

This connector/care coordinator function should have ROI clearance and

staff must be equitably compensated city employees or staff from community based organizations.

**Commented [JJ5]:** Optimal client ratio? 8:12 or 8:10 depending on acuity?

Simmons: advise against a set ratio b/c of the variability of cases and how they change over time.

Find some balance between a set ratio and ensuring coordinators are not overloaded ...maybe a cap?

**Commented [JJ6]:** “Scattered Site Coop Model” is something to review and see how it fits/integrates....

Reconcile 1 person across the system with the 3 levels of case management.

**2-OCC oversight on communication and the need to find optimal technology for a communication process that works across the system AND central record keeping database**

**Commented [JJ7]:** Consider regular meetings with Emergency, HSH, and others to work collaboratively...

**Commented [JJ8]:** Examples from other similar sized cities

Communication can break down between programs and agencies and there needs to be easier and more dependable ways for systems of care to communicate with each other. We recommend the identification and use of an optimal communication tool that works beyond systems of care and can link multiple agencies and programs.

The optimal communication tool will also include a central record-keeping database.

This recommendation is particularly important for the placement and transition of clients. There are many instances where communication breakdowns lead to gaps between programs as clients move into “next phases” of their care plan. A communication tool across the system of care could enable more fluid transitions through fluid communications that can highlight more than one option or plan for placement and transition.

**3-OCC should create a continuum of care process throughout the care system**

Individuals get released from PES or other acute crisis services because they are no longer classified as acute. They become subacute (can drink and eat on their own) and are discharged without connection to a next level of care.

**No person should be discharged from care without a safe-landing and appropriate care coordination including but not limited to housing.**

Funding for this continuum of care (including housing) needs to be secured:

- Prop C
- Managed care plan

**4- Case load ratios should be based on client acuity and intensity**

- 8 to 12 for high acuity
- 13 to 25 for moderate
- 26 to 40 for stable (with housing)

**5-Enhancing case management systems that are already working and effective**

- Focus units (cultural, language, gender orientation, justice-involved)
- Peer escorts/support services
- Include coordinated transport system as part of the OCC responsibility
- Open more and build upon Peer Centers and Drop in Centers to connect people to care

**Commented [JJ9]:** Simmons: Cal AIM, HSH partnership, expecting BHS will move to EPIC...EPIC may have some connector capacity.

**Commented [JJ10]:** See above comments related to securing funding (larger, policy and legislative work). Prop C is most accessible, but the City should be pushed to develop more funding streams for MH (ballot measures, reviewing existing budgets, etc)

**Commented [JJ11]:** Consider including definitions for these levels. And what about if clients change level mid point?

Marlo: BHS has different levels, but they align. Consider how to integrate- for ex, the upper limit of “moderate” is higher here than what BHS is considering