**Developing the Agenda for Stakeholder Engaged Research in Behavioral Health**

Alger Hall, Rhode Island College

8:00am-12:00 noon, July 26, 2019

8:00-8:30 – Registration and breakfast

8:30-8:40 – Introduction and Review of RICAP work to date

Susan Storti and Bart Laws

8:40-9:40 – Overview of Today’s Discussion Topics and Procedures

 Ron Seifer, Christine Brown, James McNulty, Stephen Gumbley,

and Mavis Nimoh

9:40-9:50 Sort into discussion groups.

9:50 – 11:00 Small group discussions

See Page Two

11:05 -- 5 minute break and return to plenary

11:05 – 11:55 Group report-back and discussion

 Elected reporters

11:55 Wrap up remarks from the chairs

 Ron Seifer and Stephen Gumbley

**Discussion Groups**

Note: The bulleted items are not meant to be exclusive, but suggestive.

1. Timely diagnosis and prevention

Facilitator: Ron Seifer

* Differences and overlap between SUD and mental illness
* Identification of affected/at risk students in schools and appropriate responses
* Primary Care
* Community based programs
* Military

2. Families of children, adolescents and adults

 Facilitator: Christine Brown

* Differences in family involvement in SUD and mental illness
* How to support families affected by behavioral health problems
* How to positively engage families of people living with behavioral health issues

3. Co-occurring SUD and other mental disorders

 Facilitator: James McNulty

* Concepts of recovery for people with co-occurring disorders
* Integrated vs. parallel treatment
* Clinical settings, site and system level issues

4. Recovery pathways

 Facilitator: Stephen Gumbley

* Definition/conception of recovery for SUD vs. mental illness
* Natural history of illness and recovery
* Non-abstinent recovery
* Differences in severity
* Agency and choice; how to design programs to give people captaincy in their own recovery

5. Criminal Justice

 Facilitator: Mavis Nimoh

* Diversion (pre vs. post-arrest), alternative sentencing
* Juvenile justice system, disproportionate minority contact, diversion, positive resources
* Management and treatment within correctional institutions
* Re-entry

Small Group discussion Process

Our discussion groups will use a modified form of what is called Nominal Group Technique. This is a method for generating ideas, that assures that everyone can fully participate. (In this context the word “nominal” refers to nominating, i.e. proposing ideas.) Standard nominal groups begin with a period in which participants can silently think about and write down ideas. However, that won’t be necessary today since you’ll have time to think about it during the opening presentations.

The goal is to generate research questions. These could be intervention trials, evaluations of policy innovations or comparisons of different policies, natural history studies, anything that is suitable for rigorous study and can help improve outcomes that matter to people with behavioral health needs and their families and friends.

1. The facilitator conducts a round robin asking each participant for one idea each round. A note taker captures items on a flipchart or white marker board. Participants may “pass” if they have no idea to share in a round. The round robin is complete when all ideas have been captured. The rules are:

* **There are no dumb ideas.** Period. It is a brainstorming session, not a serious matter that requires only serious solutions.
* **Don’t criticize other people’s ideas.** This is not a debate, discussion or forum for one person to display superiority over another.
* **Build on other people’s ideas.** Often an idea suggested by one person can trigger a bigger and/or better idea by another person. Or a variation of an idea on the board could be the next “velcro” idea. It is this building of ideas that leads to out of the box thinking and fantastic ideas.
* **Reverse the thought of “quality over quantity.”** Here we want quantity; the more creative ideas the better.

It’s okay to ask for clarification or to encourage people to build out their ideas. Sometimes one person’s idea will be an extension or a subset of a previous idea. That’s fine! The note taker can try to organize the ideas as she or he records them.

2. Discuss all items to ensure everyone has a good understanding of them. You may wish to combine some items.

3. Vote to prioritize the items. Every participant will have five stickers that they can place on the items they favor.

4. Discuss the results. Ask the participants if they feel the results are valid. Would they change the priority of any of the items? Seek consensus.

Each group will appoint a reporter who will take the lead in presenting the results to the full symposium. However, other members of the group will be welcome to add their own observations and thoughts.