



RPC Meeting Summary – September 26, 2012

Welcome and Overview

Myel Jenkins, Program Officer, Sierra Health Foundation, provided a welcome highlighting three major milestones of RPC since the last meeting on August 1: the RPC Launch, press coverage and the release of the Respite Services RFP. She acknowledged the commitment of RPC members and celebrated the most recent successes including the RPC Launch for community members to learn about the RPC and to walk through the Request for Proposals (RFP) process. Two RPC members spoke at the Launch: Arden Tucker and Leslie Napper, who contributed greatly to the event's success. The RPC and the event received press coverage in *The Sacramento Bee* and on Capital Public Radio.

Another success was the release of the respite services Request for Proposals on August 17. A range of proposals were submitted by the September 18 deadline. For confidentiality reasons the number of proposals cannot be disclosed until the RPC October 31 funding recommendation meeting.

Myel reviewed the goals for the day, which includes *Leslie Cooksy, Evaluation Director, Sierra Health Foundation*, guiding the development of a logic model for the Innovation project. Before the logic model process, Myel invited RPC member Arden Tucker to share her insight on the RPC Launch.

Arden Tucker welcomed everyone to the first RPC meeting after the Launch. Arden shared that it was exciting to see the room fill up with a full house of enthusiastic participants who began networking as they entered the room. Approximately 80 people representing 40 different organizations attended the Launch. People had many questions, which resulted in a FAQ being posted on the Sierra Health Foundation web site. Leslie Napper courageously shared her experiences as a mental health consumer and her story was highlighted in the *Sacramento Bee's* article on the RPC. Arden noted the importance of understanding the consumer experience. While the meeting surpassed expectations, there were suggestions for improvement for future meetings. Refer to the document titled *Meeting Evaluation Summary August 30, 2012* for details. This event furthered the goals of RPC, educated the community about the state of RPC in Sacramento County, and strengthened the partnerships that make the RPC possible. Myel thanked Arden Tucker and invited Leslie Cooksy to present.

RPC Group Photo -rescheduled for the October 18 meeting.

Welcome to the World of Evaluation: Introduction

Leslie Cooksy, Evaluation Director, Sierra Health Foundation, expressed her excitement and willingness to be a positive support in the evaluation process. Leslie explained that she is an internal evaluator – a Sierra Health Foundation employee. She described the learning objectives for the day. Refer to the PowerPoint presentation: *Welcome to the World of Evaluation* for more details. As part of the introductions and warm up, she asked the group to share what they think of when they hear the word evaluation. Impressions of evaluation included the following: Informative, Accountability, Outcomes, Grade, Critical, Helpful, Judging and Discerning, Follow Up, Success and Improvement, Effectiveness and Proof (guest).

Leslie stated that this group already has a good sense of what evaluation is and its purpose. She further explained that there are many parts of evaluation and the audience determines the focus. The RPC members will be the users of evaluation, as will mental health practitioners, funders, policymakers and other stakeholders. She explained the importance of systematic data collection, analysis and of data sources (people or other sources). Leslie emphasized focusing on what we can learn from evaluation, including unintended outcomes.

Leslie reviewed the reasons why evaluation is done and shared a sample of different reasons/questions that evaluation can help solve/answer. She emphasized the importance of confidentiality and explained that an evaluator can be the safe “go-between” person between service provider and client. Evaluation can be performed by an internal or external evaluator and both require technical skills. She discussed the pros and cons to each approach and emphasized that while external evaluators can offer independence and may increase credibility, internal evaluators provide oversight and the ability to facilitate the evaluation process. Leslie presented fictional scenarios on internal and external evaluators to illustrate the strengths and weaknesses of different evaluation approaches. She asked RPC members to identify problems with each scenario. The scenarios can be found in the PowerPoint Presentation.

Example problems from Scenario 1: Internal evaluator include:

- Data is skewed and inaccurate, didn't talk to all participants and didn't collect data on what went wrong
- Reviewing only positive outcomes, unlikely to find negative outcomes
- He calls participants but doesn't visit them; conducts informal conversations
- No baseline of knowledge to compare results
- 300-page report too long, not useful
- No staff has been talked to, only nurses

Example problems from Scenario 2: External evaluator include:

- Survey too long
- Low survey response rate; only 15% responded: they may share common motivations or characteristics; not enough response to draw conclusions
- No interviewing of mothers, or other data from target population
- No baseline/starting point data
- External evaluator may be objective but has limited experience

Leslie completed the introduction to evaluation by reviewing the MHS Innovation evaluation requirements and learning goals along with the timeline for next steps. It is anticipated that the RFP for an external evaluator will be released in November/December and on board by February 2013.

Welcome to the World of Evaluation: Overview and Intro to Logic Models

Leslie described the contents and uses of logic models. She went over hypothetical: If..., then..., scenarios, which are critical thought processes in a logic model. The product of this process results in two or three types of outcomes. The first type is immediate or short-term outcomes, which are a direct result of program activities. Intermediate outcomes occur as a result of the immediate outcomes. The third type is long-term outcomes, which ideally impact society and achieve change at the community level.

Logic models can vary greatly with content, but all give a full picture of what the project or program is designed to do. The Innovation Project Logic Model is intended to serve three purposes: provide a framework to guide the evaluation, help identify priority performance measures for monitoring, and serve as a resource to explain the purpose of the RPC.

Welcome to the World of Evaluation: Develop Logic Model and Discuss Next Steps

Leslie and Deb Marois facilitated a Logic Model building exercise with the RPC. First, RPC members refined the list of resources and activities. A list of outcomes previously generated by RPC members was used to help determine direct, intermediate and long-term outcomes for the logic model.

Q: What is the definition of immediate/intermediate/longer-term outcomes?

A: An immediate outcome can also be defined as a direct outcome. An immediate (direct) outcome leads directly to intermediate outcomes. Suggestion: Logic models can be developed in reverse order (backwards) by starting with long-term outcomes and then working your way from right to left. See page 6 of PowerPoint presentation for long-term goals.

Q: How can we distinguish between outcomes and activities? For example, is media coverage an outcome or an activity?

A: One question to ask: What produced the result? To determine if something is an outcome: What activity generated that? Also try the "if-then" logic: If you have media coverage, then what do you get?

Q: Can activities be added to the RPC Logic Model as we go through this?

A: Yes, as gaps are discovered they can be added to activities.

Deb reviewed the logic model and during the group discussion some outcomes were moved from their categories in which they were originally placed of immediate/direct, intermediate, long-term to one in which the group felt was more appropriate.

Discussion/Reflections

- There is an important resource missing from the RPC: law enforcement participation. One member expressed concern about waiting until January to add new members. Myel reminded the group that the RPC decided last spring to proceed as is and wait until January 2013 to recruit new members. It is a natural turning point after the RFP release and selecting new awardees. Community members are invited to RPC meetings and members are encouraged to invite prospective members to attend.
- There is a gap between some activities and direct activities. Programs need to be implemented before there is an impact on consumers.
- Some outcomes may show up in more than one column.

Next Steps: Leslie will organize the draft logic model and present it at the October 18 RPC meeting for review. RPC members will receive the draft logic model prior to the next meeting and are asked to review it prior to the meeting. On October 18, RPC members will have the opportunity to refine and/or include additional resources, activities and outcomes. Leslie also referred RPC members to a list of performance measures that were submitted in the respite services proposals. Members are asked to review this in preparation for the next RPC meeting. Key questions are included in the PowerPoint.

Respite Services Proposal Update

Myel provided an update on the RFP process and emphasized the unique community collaborative element: the RPC. The RPC will be making the funding recommendation to Sierra Health Foundation. The respite services external review team is robust and comprised of RPC members, DBHS and Sierra Health Foundation staff, and community stakeholders representing consumers and family members, cultural community representatives, mental health providers and system partners. External reviewers participated in an orientation conference call and will submit their proposal ratings to Sierra Health Foundation near the end of October.

On October 29 the Review Committee will come together to discuss top-rated proposals and make funding recommendations for RPC deliberation. These recommendations will come to the RPC on October 31. The RPC will see all proposal scores and deliberate on the funding recommendations from the external review committee. Myel reminded members to refer to the updated RPC meeting schedule and funding timeline.

Q: The agency I work for submitted an RFP. Which meeting am I excluded from?

A: The Conflict of Interest is still in process. At this time, we are looking to see what the top-rated proposals will be. We anticipate having this information around October 26 and will let you know how that impacts your participation at the October 31 meeting. For now, please save the date. We hope to have more information at the October 18 meeting. We thank you in advance for your patience as we make a thoughtful decision about this process.