RPC Meeting Summary – October 1, 2013

Welcome
Myel Jenkins, Program Officer, Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management, opened the meeting. Myel announced the County of Sacramento, Division of Behavioral Health Services has a new Deputy Director, former RPC member Dorian Kittrell. Myel also introduced the new RPC Co-Chairs, Leslie Napper and Ebony Chambers.

Instructions & Warm Up
Leslie Napper and Ebony Chambers, RPC Co-Chairs, thanked the RPC for their confidence in them and said they look forward to bringing RPC perspectives to the RPC Planning Committee meetings. Leslie and Ebony discussed the meeting goals and the ground rules. Deb Marois, Facilitator, Converge CRT Consulting, welcomed everyone to the meeting and reiterated the meeting goals and the start of the ongoing conversation about sustainability.

The warm up question for the meeting was: What is one comment, insight or burning question you have about the big picture of MHSA and how it connects to your work in the RPC?

Main reflections from the warm up discussion included:
- What will long-term funding for the RPC look like?****
- What will the RPC look like 5-10 years down the road?**
- Nationally – CA/RPC is very innovative, we've come farther than many states – we're pioneers*
- Feels good to provide programs for community.
- There are resources available for grantees and there is much to be proud of.
- What will happen to clients if programs stop?
- Excited about new Community Services and Support funding available for younger target populations.
- Remember to keep consumers in crisis at the forefront.
- Amazed how people have come together to launch this/respite services.
- How can we remain a proactive organization and secure continued funding?
- Need to think about our role as community ambassadors and levels of sustainability: community-driven process, respite services funding and partnership.
- Sustainability is on everyone’s radar statewide, we’re learning, leaving a legacy.
- Wish we could have an educational session – brainstorm with the community how to sustain respite services after Round 3 is complete.
- Next few months existing time for strategic thinking, decide how to move forward based on learning.
- Challenging to make decisions about what to sustain without data.
- The MHSA Steering Committee could have a role to play in sustainability, potential role of the MHSA Financial Oversight Subcommittee.
- We know MHSA funds for innovation are not indefinite – awesome start.
- How/will statewide programs be sustained? How to ensure programs are working?
- How to make RPC accomplishments more visible in the community?

Round 2 Funding Update

Myel Jenkins, Program Officer, Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management, presented the Round 2 Funding Update, which included an update on the Round 2 timeline, funding recommendations, grantees’ next steps and RPC members’ next steps. Refer to the PowerPoint presentation Round 2 Funding Presentation for more details.

Questions & Answers

Q. Can we look at performance outcomes of Round 1 grantees versus what they said they would do?
A: The first grantees reports are due October 31. The report will go to the Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee for review. The RPC will be reviewing reports on a regular basis. The December meeting will be the first meeting to review grantees reports for this membership term. It is important to note that the RPC will be reviewing summaries of the reports.

Main reflections on Round 2 Funding Update and the Respite Continuum Gaps:
- Increase in services:
  - Cultural/ethnic groups including undocumented population (grey area)*
  - LGBTQ*
  - Ages 18-25 (young adults) early college years/early adulthood could benefit from respite services uninsured barrier and older adults who need support
- Need support:
  - Children with complex needs who remain with birth families
  - Homeless men, not necessarily fathers
  - Dads with dependent children
  - TAY drop-in center for a time out break with activities
  - Early release program prisoners (please note: there are funding restrictions and potentially realignment money available for this population)
- Need for peer-run residential, address licensing barriers and build capacity

MHSA Update: Thinking Strategically about Sustainability

Kathryn Skrabo and Jane Ann LeBlanc from the Sacramento County Division of Behavioral Health Services presented information on the Mental Health Services Act Update, which included information on local and statewide Mental Health Services Act projects and funding, and a shift to a three-year plan with community input. Refer to the PowerPoint Presentation MHSA Update Presentation for more details.

Questions & Answers

Q. What programs will MHSA funding impact in Sacramento County?
A: Funding cuts will not directly impact our local programs but will definitely impact statewide programs including the Stigma and Discrimination campaign, Each Mind Matters and suicide prevention statewide programs. However, local programs may be impacted if the state requests funding from the local programs to continue statewide efforts.
Q. Where are the Mental Health Statewide Advisory Committee meetings?
A. The workgroups are public, and information is available on the Mental Health Services Oversight and Accountability Commission (MHSOAC) website (http://www.mhsoac.ca.gov/). There is a listen-only call-in opportunity for those unable to attend the meetings in-person.

Q: If an Innovation project is successful can it be incorporated into Sacramento County PEI or CSS funding or another funding source?
A: Yes, there is a possibility. However, there is a challenge of aligning the timing of the population and defining project success, or what pieces of a project have been successful.

Q: Are there other grants that will be available in the future?
A: Yes, that is something to consider. We will be looking for other opportunities, grant awards and partnerships that are not available yet.

Working Dinner & Dialogue
Dialogue questions were discussed by RPC members during dinner. The questions were:
Reflect on the MHSA update you just heard...
- What did you learn?
- What future do you see for this community-driven process?

If there is a future...
- What is your role in sustaining this community-driven process?
- How can you position the RPC to raise awareness of the community-driven process and the respite projects?

Main reflections included:
- We know what’s needed at direct service level – the challenge is getting our voices heard at state level
- Barriers with closed meetings at DHCS
- We’ve come a long way in Sacramento County – still have a ways to go getting families involved – meetings aren’t a priority
- The county has tried a lot but without CA DMH, the family voice has been lost “voice=choice”
- Hosting community sessions with grantees on sustainability, provide support, ex: grant writing
- Explore possibility of RPC involvement in assessing projects – we bring a unique perspective aside from AIR after Round 3.
- How can we learn from this process and spread the successful practices in collaboration throughout the county?
- Policy and Sustainability Committee members should consider attending MHS/A/MHB meetings to be a voice for the RPC
- Communications committee could work on talking points to share the same voice/message about the RPC.
Myel discussed that the Communications Committee will start meeting soon now that Brian Fitzgerald has been hired as Public Affairs and Communications Director and will be able to help provide staff support.

**Evaluation Update & AIR Interview Selection Criteria**

*Leslie Cooksy, Evaluation Director, Sierra Health Foundation,* reviewed the AIR evaluation process, and the upcoming interview process. The interview process includes the recommendation of two RPC members as interviewees by the RPC Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee to AIR. The Grantmaking and Evaluation committee is soliciting input from the RPC on the selection of the RPC interviewees. Refer to the PowerPoint presentation *Evaluation Interview Selection Presentation* for more details. The RPC members broke out into groups to discuss the current composition of the proposed RPC member interview pool, the missing stakeholder perspectives and what priorities are important to select the final interviewees. Deb led a discussion of what criteria and priorities are important to consider in selecting the remaining two RPC interviewees. These priorities included:

- Need more consumer perspectives*
- Primary stakeholder groups: cultural/ethnic, homeless organization/lived experience, family member of a SED child.
- Demographic groups: API and/or Middle Eastern
- Secondary stakeholder groups: LGBTQ, faith based, education
- Balance of providers and consumers being interviewed.

The RPC Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee will use this information to make final interview selections.

**Next Steps & Closing**

David Schroeder from the RPC Membership and Governance Committee discussed the gaps in the stakeholder perspective, which are: law enforcement, juvenile justice, transition age youth, and hospital systems. David encouraged RPC members to reach out to their networks to fill the stakeholder gaps. Myel discussed the vouchers and transportation assistance available for RPC members, and the potential mentorship opportunities available for transition age youth.

The next RPC meeting is Wednesday, November 6 at 2:30 p.m.

**Bike Rack**

The RPC discussed future tours of grantee projects. There are time and confidentiality considerations with visiting a respite site. Additionally, Myel discussed that RPC members would need to ensure attendance to honor grantee time. The straw poll for interest in touring grantee sites was: 12 yes, 4 no and 1 maybe.