RPC Meeting Summary – May 14, 2012

Welcome
Chet Hewitt, Sierra Health Foundation President and CEO, is honored to partner with Sacramento County. The foundation has a deep and profound understanding of the importance of health and well-being. In this partnership, Sierra Health Foundation commits to:

- Treat RPC members with respect
- Make RPC meeting times productive
- Make the work you do in this room take shape in the real world

Mary Ann Bennett, Director of Sacramento County Behavioral Health Services, thanked the Innovation Workgroup for laying the groundwork for an approach that is unique to California. She called upon the RPC’s creativity to find and implement sustainable solutions and thanked Sierra Health for taking on the administrative aspects of this partnership, which is part of the innovation.

Myel Jenkins, Sierra Health Program Officer, expressed excitement for the work ahead, reviewed meeting goals and introduced the Sierra Health staff and the facilitation team.

Deb Marois, Facilitator, Marois Consulting & Research, introduced the RPC’s Interim Operating Guidelines, including discussion of ground rules, and all present agreed to them.

Hopes for the RPC
RPC members, staff and guests introduced themselves and shared hopes for the future of the Respite Partnership Collaborative.

The RPC hopes to make a difference and create an impact by working together to follow the innovation plan and create innovative alternatives to emergency rooms, hospitals and out-of-home care for those in crisis. We hope to stimulate valuable services for mental health consumers, families and caregivers, especially homeless populations and others that fall through the cracks. We want to create an RFP that attracts the best respite partners to provide innovative services to meet the greatest needs. We want our work to inspire other communities and to be integrated into other programs. We hope that we can grow awareness in order to attract resources to sustain this work.
Who’s in the Room?
RPC members identified their skills and talents, the stakeholder groups each represents, and which target populations they are most interested in. Members discussed gaps in representation.

Why Are We Here? The Framework for Implementing the Innovation Plan
Myel presented an overview of the Innovation Plan, some key terms, concepts and a timeline for the RPC in the next six months.

Questions & Answers
- Q: Is this money in jeopardy due to the State budget crisis? A: No, this money is already encumbered.
- Q: Will there be dialogue or education around how respite services will be provided? A: We can build this into the June meetings. A quick show of hands determined that most RPC members would like more information on respite services.
- Q: Will funding at risk of reversion go to existing programs? A: Alternatives are being considered. We don’t have enough information to make any determinations at this point.
- Q: Will outreach be provided out in the field to homeless populations? A: The RPC is asked to come up with ideas and an implementation plan to reach hard-to-reach populations.
- Q: Are we coming up with a plan on how the money is being spent or will we choose who the money is going to and what it will fund? A: From now through August, the RPC will decide criteria to inform a Request for Proposals (RFP). The RPC will review those proposals and make selections.
Collaborative Governance and Decision Making

Deb Marois presented an overview of the facilitator’s role, the purpose of meeting documentation and an introduction to collaborative governance. She emphasized that collaboration is a means to an end, not an end in itself. While the process is important, we need to keep focused on addressing mental health crisis and reducing hospitalizations through the implementation of respite services. The RPC is envisioned as a community-driven, self-governing collaborative group. However, we need to balance the development of a governance structure with the primary tasks of releasing funding into the community, informing an evaluation and launching communication strategies. Therefore, Deb proposed consensus-based decision-making guidelines and tools, which members agreed to use. Governance and structure can be revisited as needed after January 2013.

Dinner and Dialogue

RPC members discussed: reactions, priorities and suggestions to engage missing perspectives.

Priorities: Lack of youth and law enforcement representation, gaps in existing services, the need to address disparities and focus on a wellness and recovery model, increased children services, making it easier to navigate systems and access services. Some members believe it is critical to make a large impact by not diluting funding with too many small, fragmented grants. Others emphasized the need to ensure that smaller, culturally responsive organizations are included in the opportunity to provide innovative respite services.

Ideas to Engage Missing Perspectives:
- Community meetings are a good place to advertise and invite people to participate
- Use personal connections with law enforcement to identify potential members; e.g., contact Sheriff and Chief of Police
- Bring in sergeants who are out on the beat and have a conversation with them about what would make a difference.
- Reach out to TAY youth, we go to them – maybe a small committee of RPC members
- Sac Children’s Home – work with youth who are aging out

for funding. The RPC will direct what we want to learn in the evaluation and also advise on the communications strategy.

- Q: With regard to the five target populations, will we develop five RFPs to target these, or will the RPC have the opportunity to combine into one RFP, etc? A: That will be part of RPC decision making in June. The Innovation Plan is the starting point; the RPC will use it to make decisions moving forward.

- Q: I think it’s important that we know what the dollars are for this year and over the years. It will be helpful for the group to be able to define our thinking. A: The entire project amount is $8.3 million over five years. The amount available for funding respite services is being determined. Funds also are needed for staffing, evaluation and communications. The RPC needs to think about how we can thoughtfully get dollars out the door in the fall.

- Q: With the absence of law enforcement, what outreach has been made? Can individual members outreach to law enforcement? A: A discussion coming in a few moments will hopefully address that question.
• Wind Youth Services – youth could participate in a focus group
• Focus groups, surveys or some other way of gathering information on specific topics
• Communicate and coordinate with other MHSA funded projects, e.g., Supporting Community Connections

Consensus Decision Making Practice
RPC members stood near the level of agreement sign that best matched their opinion on the statement: *The RPC will revisit the question of recruiting new members in January 2013.* RPC members were evenly distributed along the continuum and offered a range of opinion. Some members expressed great concern about lack of law enforcement representation and ethnic diversity. Some believe it is important to have representation from the beginning to develop buy-in in order to see the work through. The opinion expressed was that there is a difference between having a committed member and gaining perspectives through other means. Others pointed out that it is difficult to plan for populations whose voices are not in the room. Those who agreed with the statement were primarily concerned about the time it will take to recruit and screen additional members and bring them up to speed. They believe the application and selection process was sufficient. One member felt because there was broad input into the innovation plan, it seemed more acceptable to delay bringing on new members.

Discussion Summary: There is a great desire to be inclusive of key groups that are not yet represented. There was a process to engage applicants from all of those groups. The RPC’s challenge is to engage those perspectives and decide upon a timeline to do so. Six members expressed willingness to serve on an ad-hoc membership workgroup, if one is established. Since there is no clear consensus, Deb asked RPC members to consider the discussion and return next week prepared to offer solutions that might address the range of concerns expressed.

Wrap Up and Next Steps
RPC Homework: Consider how you will stay in contact with your primary stakeholder group and represent their voice.