**RPC Meeting Summary – June 5, 2013**

**Welcome**

*Myel Jenkins, Program Officer, Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management,* welcomed everyone to the beginning of the second year of RPC. Exactly one year ago today, the collaborative began by creating the funding structure for the provision of a continuum of respite services in Sacramento County. Myel set the context for the day by reminding all RPC members that their participation is not only to represent themselves, but to bring forth their specific community stakeholder perspective(s) as a means to engage in a diverse dialogue with everyone and embrace different viewpoints. The principles of the RPC are diversity and collaboration, which are based on shared goals. There are three partners in the RPC: Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management, Sacramento County Division of Behavioral Health Services, and the Respite Partnership Collaborative (RPC). The Center for Health Program Management (the Center) provides staff and conferencing support to the RPC.

*Michelle Saeteurn, RPC Member,* welcomed all newly seated RPC members and reviewed the agenda and goals for the meeting. She also reviewed the ground rules, which help the RPC function.

**Who's in the Room?**

*Deb Marois, Facilitator, Converge CRT,* reviewed the meeting process. Each RPC member received a new binder for the 2013-2014 year with materials for the day and Deb reminded everyone to be considerate about staying on time and encouraged members to take breaks as needed throughout the meeting. RPC members introduced themselves and their stakeholder perspective(s), and shared one answer from a series of question prompts. Responses included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lessons Learned and Burning Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The process may feel daunting but fear not, and trust the process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t be intimidated by passion – feel free to speak up – your voice is valued!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a different experience – a decision making process where your voice has meaning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consensus process → through discussion we may change our opinion or choices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This work is ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots of information – can be confusing please approach returning members with questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The collaboration is evolving and expanding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can I make this process work for my community?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and mutual respect allows us to get a lot done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Main reflections included:
- Missing perspectives now in the room
- Stigma affects many groups
- MH terms are difficult to translate/interpret
- Each perspective a unique contribution – ex. Transition-Age Youth
- Members bring a lot of experiences
- Expanding our perspective about different age groups
- Challenge of providing in-patient services

RPC members participated in a get-to-know-you exercise in the form of a wall matrix that captured each RPC member’s primary and secondary stakeholder perspectives. The benefit of this activity was to become aware of who is in the room and to identify what stakeholder perspectives are still missing.

Looking Back, Looking Ahead: The RPC Story & Vision/What to Expect in 2013

Kathryn Skrabo, Program Planner, Sacramento County Division of Behavioral Health Services, presented the big picture and innovation aspects of the RPC. Kathryn shared that the RPC is funded through the Sacramento County Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) Innovation component. As part of innovation, there is an emphasis on learning how a community-driven process—the RPC - can maximize community resources. Outcomes from this learning have the potential to influence the sustainability of RPC efforts. Kathryn emphasized that respite services are not new; it is the collaborative process that is the innovation. She encouraged members to learn about other innovation projects, accessible through the State’s website. See http://www.mhsoac.ca.gov/Counties/Innovation/Innovation.aspx for more information.

Michelle Johnston, RPC Member, provided an overview of the RPC and what’s to come in the next six months. She described the RPC vision and the RFP planning process. As a result of the Round 1 RFP release, four grantees were selected based on selection criteria developed by the RPC. While the four grantees put forth strong proposals, there is still a need to fund an organization to fill the community’s need for 24/7 drop-in respite as an alternative to the emergency department or psychiatric hospitals. Michelle highlighted some key learnings from the last year: members didn’t always agree but listened to each other, this process can work, time pressure is a challenge, and great facilitation helps the process. She described the current learning which includes: how to identify providers to submit proposals for the type of respite services needed in the community, how to promote the concept of respite, which varies considerably, and how to integrate new RPC members into the ongoing work. Michelle invited all RPC members to look ahead and highlighted how the activities of each standing committee continue to advance the collective work. Refer to the RPC Charter document for more information on the structure of the RPC and the role of each standing committee.

Myel informed the RPC of the expectations for the next six months. She reviewed major milestones and deadlines, provided relevant updates on RFP review, the funding deliberation meeting in August, and the RPC Charter and binder content. There is $5 million in community grants available over three rounds of funding; refer to the Projected Outline for Three Rounds of Funding handout for more information. The RPC has two Innovation learning components related to the community-driven process and the public-private partnership. Additional
components of evaluation are the respite services. Refer to the PowerPoint presentation *RPC Collaborative Meeting June 5, 2013* for more details.

RPC members met with their respective standing committees during the working dinner.

**Collaborative Decision Making: Seeking Consensus**

Deb reviewed the basics of collaborative governance and importance of consensus decision making. She explained various topics such as: the role of the facilitator, the reason for consensus, the difference between interest and position and more. Refer to the PowerPoint presentation *How We’ll Work Together: Intro to Collaborative Governance* for more details.

In order to practice seeking consensus with the RPC, the following proposal was put forth: **The RPC will select co-chairs in September to begin their terms in October.**

Myel explained that the RPC shall elect two co-chairs to collaborate with the RPC partners, DBHS and the Center, to serve on behalf of the entire RPC to support the facilitation of the RPC and to have a voice in the development of RPC meetings. The service would be from October 2013 to May 2014. Refer to the RPC Charter, page 6, item 7, for a more in-depth description of the co-chairs.

**Q:** Will the co-chairs be expected to participate in standing committees as well?

**A:** Currently, this has not been discussed and the question will be deferred to the Membership and Governance Committee.

**Q:** Will they be able to be re-elected?

**A:** The question will be deferred to the Membership and Governance Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels/Gradients of Agreement Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The RPC agreed to select co-chairs in September to begin their terms in October. Comments from RPC members who **strongly agree:**

- We need co-chairs to represent a more transparent community process.
- Gives everyone time to see if they are interested and able to attend/commit.
- Governance Committee has already been in motion and knows what it takes to be a part of a committee, and we may not want to be a co-chair. Give everyone a chance to step up.
- Let newly seated RPC members settle in and then take on more roles. There will be a large amount of work in August regarding funding decisions, so it is best to wait until the fall to elect co-chairs.

Comments from RPC members who **agree with minor concerns:**

- Why are we waiting so long to elect people?
- New to RPC and not knowing the answers to the questions brought up. ***
* indicates more than one person agrees with this comment.

**Next Steps**
Myel concluded the meeting by thanking everyone for completing their first meeting of the year. She made a few housekeeping announcements regarding the submission of evaluation forms by each RPC member and recycling name badges and table tents at the end of each meeting.

The next RPC meeting will take place on July 16, 2013.