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Evaluation Progress
Plan for Tonight

• Provide input on the Request for Proposals for external evaluator
• Review and refine logic model
• Identify priority performance measures
Outline of the RFP for the External Evaluator

- Introduction
- Evaluation Requirements
- Guiding Evaluation Questions
- Evaluation Uses and Audiences
- Qualifications
- Narrative Guidelines
Introduction and Requirements

- Introduction =
  - Same information as in respite services RFP

- Statement of requirements =
  - focus on Innovation Plan learning goals of testing the community driven process
Guiding Evaluation Questions

1) To what extent and in what ways (if any) has the RPC increased or strengthened interagency and community collaboration?

2) What were strengths and weaknesses of the contributions of each of the partners to the partnership and of the partnership overall?

3) How have resources been used? What is the average cost per consumer? How does this compare to the average cost for the same consumers to be served in emergency departments?

4) What is the mix of respite services provided? To what extent (if any) do the services duplicate each other or existing services? What gaps, if any, are there in the services?

5) What is the quality of the services? To what extent (if any) do the services produce the intended outcomes, especially reducing the use of the emergency department?
Evaluation Purposes

• Receive regular feedback for mid-course corrections
• Inform decisions about the allocation of year 2 and 3 funds
• Decide whether to continue the approach to funding respite services
• Reflect on learning goals and effectiveness of the community-driven process for the MHSA
• Influence mental health policies and programs
**Evaluation Team Qualifications**

- **Skills/experience in:**
  - Evaluation design and implementation
  - Working with partnerships and collaboratives
  - Working within culturally diverse communities
  - Mental health services
Proposal Narrative Guidelines

- What needs to be included:
  - Evaluation design and rationale, quality control strategies, and reporting strategies
  - Management plan, including staff qualifications and timeline
  - Budget and budget justification
Next Steps for RFP

- October: Revise to create a draft for review
- November:
  - Review by ad hoc committee (if approved by RPC)
  - Internal review by Sierra Health Foundation
  - Release RFP
- January:
  - Receive and review proposals
  - Interview top candidates and select external evaluator
- February: External evaluator on board
Return of the Logic Model
Respite Partnership Collaborative Logic Model – 1st Draft

Activities
- Participate in RPC and community stakeholder meetings
- Make recommendations about RPC membership and governance
- Create and release RFP
- Review proposals and recommend funding
- Select grantees
- Conduct outreach
- Develop new partnerships and networking with other community resources and other MHSA programs
- Explore options for leveraging and sustainability
- Develop technology to track respite options
- Participate in evaluation
- Develop communication plan (include coverage of RPC)

Direct Outcomes
- Increased capacity for respite service
- More choices for consumers and family members
- Development, activation, and implementation of programs
- Reduced wait time for services
- Increased relevance of respite care to target populations
- Appropriate aftercare generated
- Increased utilization of respite services
- Increased interagency and community collaboration
- Buy-in from consumers/family members
- Increased awareness for needed respite

Intermediate
- Faster stabilization of individuals in or near crisis
- Decreased use of ED
- Increased consumer satisfaction with services
- Increased coping skills
- Reduced fear for treatment, including cultural populations
- Public-private partnerships
- Better use of existing funding
- Collaborations continue
- Continued funding of successful programs

Longer-term
- Increased quality of services and aftercare
- More effective use of ER and 911
- Increased sustainability of services
- Increased availability of services
- Reduced hospitalization for mental health crises
- Reduced trauma of treatment
- Reduced suicides
- Reduced incarcerations
- Stronger and continued interagency and community collaboration
- Continued funding of successful programs

Inputs: Innovation Plan, MHSA Guidelines, MHSA/DBHS Funding, SHF infrastructure; Volunteers with lived experience, Other volunteers, Existing partnerships and relationships, Published reports from similar programs. Missing resource: Law Enforcement. Activities that are assumed: DBHS has selected the administrative entity and continues to participate and oversee project. Sierra Health is convening and supporting the collaborative and managing funds and the external evaluation.
Tracing the Logic

- For each activity, what is the direct outcome?
- For the direct outcome, what is the intermediate outcome?
- For the intermediate outcome, what is the long-term outcome?
Options for improving the model

- Delete an item
- Add an item
- Move an item from one column to another
- Reword to make an item clearer
- Merge items that are overlapping
Next Steps for Logic Model

- Revise based on today’s work
- Use to organize performance measures
- Use a framework for internal and external evaluation
- Use a resource to communicate with potential partners
Performance Measures

- RPC task: Identify priority performance measures

- How the information about RPC priorities will be used:
  - Selection of common performance measures that all grantees need to report
  - Identification of measures for individual grantees
  - Information for external evaluator about RPC priorities
Review of Performance Measures

- **Clear** -- Will grantees know what information is being requested?
- **Important** -- will the information be useful to you in assessing the funded projects?
- **Feasible** -- will the grantees be able to collect the information without undue burden?
- **Relevant** -- does the measure relate to an item in the logic model?
Thank you!