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- Evaluation objectives
- Data and methods
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- Next steps
RPC innovation project evaluation objectives

- Assess the extent to which the RPC innovation project:
  1. Promotes successful collaboration between public and private organizations in Sacramento County.
  2. Demonstrates a community-driven process.
  3. Improves the quality and outcomes of respite services in Sacramento County.
Data and methods

- Document review
- 15 key informant interviews
- RPC survey
  - 79% (30/38 recipients) took part in the survey
- Community survey (45 providers and 44 Mental Health Board/Mental Health Service Act Steering Committee members)
  - 31% (28/89 recipients) took part in the survey
Limitations

- Data are from materials you are familiar with (e.g., meeting notes)

- Data are from DBHS, the Center, and RPC members; not grantees

- Captures early experiences
  - Document review as of May 2013 and interviews/surveys as of approximately December 2013
# Timeline of data collection activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RPC Document review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Document Review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee site visits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- RPC Document review: Q4 in 2013
- RPC interviews: Q1 in 2013, Q4 in 2014
- RPC survey: Q3 in 2013, Q4 in 2014
- Community survey: Q3 in 2013, Q1 in 2014, Q2 in 2014, Q1 in 2015
- Grantee Document Review: Q3 in 2013, Q4 in 2013, Q1 in 2014
- Grantee site visits: Q3 in 2013, Q4 in 2013, Q1 in 2014, Q2 in 2014, Q3 in 2014, Q4 in 2014, Q1 in 2015
Results – Objective 1

Extent to which RPC innovation project promotes successful collaboration between public and private organizations in Sacramento County
Promoting collaboration between public and private partners

- **Successes**
  - Collaboration perceived as positive by members
  - DBHS and the Center are learning from one another

- **Challenges**
  - Leadership roles are refined as RPC innovation project progresses, and roles continually need to be communicated
  - Community collaboration can be strengthened
Collaboration perceived as positive

- Members see collaboration as positive
  - Most survey respondents (26 out of 28) agreed or strongly agreed that DBHS, the Center, and RPC members work collaboratively

- DBHS and the Center see the collaboration as a chance to learn from one another and to try to build on each other’s strengths
  - “They’re really two different cultures, the culture within the county government and the culture within more of the private, non-profit sector… we’re trying to…understand each other’s culture and resources and limitations and processes.”
Leadership roles are refined as the innovation project progresses

- Innovation plan defined leadership roles, but putting the plan’s descriptions into practice can be challenging
  - “It’s a challenge…wanting to give things time to take their own course, but then also needing to guide and lead the process and achieve deliverables.”
Community collaboration can be strengthened

- RPC members are not sure how the community views the RPC innovation project
  - Most (64%) RPC respondents ‘don’t know’ if the RPC innovation project is respected in the community

- Community member awareness could be higher
  - 32% of community respondents (9/28) had not heard of the RPC innovation project
  - 53% of community respondents who had heard of the RPC innovation project (9/17) didn’t know if the RPC had sufficient representation from stakeholders to accomplish its objectives
Results – Objective 2

Assess extent to which RPC innovation project demonstrates a community-driven process
Demonstrating a community-driven process

- **Strengths**
  - Process for providing input perceived as equalizing by members

- **Challenges**
  - DBHS, the Center, and RPC members have been building a plane while flying it
  - All are trying to balance process with efficiency

- **RPC innovation project is becoming more community-driven**
Process for providing public input

- Previous process feels cursory
  - “…Well, that’s really all it is, really is the public’s invited and you have two minutes to speak…”

- Current process offers opportunities for deliberation

- Current process perceived as equalizing
  - “It negates the us and them in terms of DBHS and Sierra being them and collaborative as us… they’re not holding power, it’s being dispersed by having committees, by having co-chairs, by soliciting members of the collaborative who are, have lived experience.”
Building a plane while flying it

- Simultaneously
  - Operationalizing the RPC innovation project goals through RFP development and grantee selection
  - Communicating to the community
  - Building infrastructure to facilitate the achievement of purpose and goals
Trying to balance process with efficiency

- **RPC innovation project**
  - “I mean it is hard when you have people with different degrees of power at the table and with different abilities to actually make decisions and then move the decisions along.”

- **RPC meeting structure**
  - “Just trying to have it be a community driven and a participatory process, but then having to work within the parameters and deadlines is challenging.”
In its early phases, the RPC innovation project may not have been as community driven as it could be:
- “There are times where it is community driven and times that it is community informed…”

Examples: agenda setting and budget:
- “… if I would give any feedback… it would be to, you know, really specifically ask the members what they would like to see out of the next meeting or topics that they want to discuss.”
Becoming more community-driven

Influence in deciding on the actions and policies for the RPC, by group

Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management
- A lot of influence: 79%
- Some influence: 18%
- No influence: 7%

Sacramento County Division of Behavioral Health Services (DBHS)
- A lot of influence: 59%
- Some influence: 38%
- No influence: 3%

RPC members
- A lot of influence: 45%
- Some influence: 52%
- No influence: 0%
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Becoming more community-driven

Influence in deciding on the actions and policies for the RPC, by group

- **RPC facilitator**: 48% A lot of Influence, 34% Some Influence, 17% No Influence
- **Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee**: 58% A lot of Influence, 46% Some Influence, 0% No Influence
- **Governance and Membership Committee**: 59% A lot of Influence, 41% Some Influence, 4% No Influence
- **Sustainability, Public Policy, and Collaboration Committee**: 71% A lot of Influence, 11% Some Influence, 11% No Influence
- **Communication Committee**: 54% A lot of Influence, 38% Some Influence, 8% No Influence

# of Respondents
Results – Objective 3

Assess extent to which the RPC innovation project improves the quality and outcomes of respite services in Sacramento County
Improves respite services in Sacramento County

- RPC members and the community feel the RPC innovation project is making progress in improving respite
- RPC members’ have their own definitions of respite
- RPC members have two possible roles for supporting grantee sustainability
- The community considers sustainability when considering funding mechanisms
The RPC is making progress in implementing the activities that have potential to improve respite care services. 88% agree.

The RPC is essential to the improvement of respite care services in Sacramento County. 81% agree.

The RPC is improving mental health outcomes for people at risk of experiencing crises. 65% agree.
Community perceptions of the effects of the RPC innovation project on respite care services (n=16)

- The RPC is making progress in implementing the activities that have potential to improve respite services: 69% agree, 13% disagree, 19% don't know.
- The RPC is essential to the improvement of respite care services in Sacramento County: 69% agree, 6% disagree, 25% don't know.
- The RPC is improving mental health outcomes for people at risk of experiencing crises: 63% agree, 13% disagree, 25% don't know.
RPC members’ definitions of respite services

- **Defined as a “break”**
  - For a person experiencing a mental health crisis, or from the stresses in life.
  - For the caregiver or family member who is helping to provide care and support for the person experiencing a mental health crisis.

- **Cultural context matters**
  - “But I think the piece to it is really for the RPC to look at what are the barriers for agencies and being able to provide respite and what are, and but also looking at it from a cultural perspective as well.”
Possible roles for RPC members

- Checking in with current grantees

- Acting as a champion
  - “...the organizations that had kind of seeded and gotten the foothold would have created sort of a base of people that wanted to continue to support them...when new programs come up and if they're successful, then you usually have champions.”
Community considers sustainability

- “... Once you get the community all excited about something and they know that this is a resource, when you turn it off, it’s really hard...even having a two year cycle ...by the time you get a grant and you hire your staff and you get the project going the year is over.”
Next Steps
# Timeline of data collection activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC Document review</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RPC survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community survey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Document Review</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee site visits</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RPC Document review for 2013 Q3 through 2016 Q1 is indicated.
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