Welcome
Myel Jenkins, Program Officer, Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management, opened the meeting and welcomed RPC members and also Grace Wang from American Institutes for Research. Myel reviewed significant accomplishments by the RPC collaborative and the RPC project in 2013. Accomplishments included the funding of Round 2 respite service agencies and the establishment of the collaborative governance structure. Ebony Chambers and David Schroeder, RPC Co-Chairs, reviewed the meeting goals and ground rules.

Deb Marois, Facilitator, Converge CRT, welcomed everyone to the December meeting and led member introductions.

Round 1 Respite Services Grantee Progress Reports
Myel Jenkins, Program Officer, Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management, introduced the Progress Report Recommendations Process. The reports are grant requirements of the respite service contracts, and indicate where organizations are in their performance measures. Year 2 Scopes of Work and performance measures were confirmed during contract negotiations in June 2013 and were based on each organization’s initial proposals. The majority of performance measures were created by the RPC in September 2012, but each organization also has organization-specific performance measures. Myel acknowledged the work of the RPC Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee in approving the reports on the committee level at their November committee meeting.

Lyn Corbett, RPC Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee Co-Chair, and Michelle Johnston, RPC Member and Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee member, presented the Progress Report Recommendations. RPC members have the option to approve the committee recommendation to approve the report, which would release 20% of grant funds, or not approve the recommendation to approve report and delay funds. Refer to the PowerPoint presentation Progress Report Recommendations on the RPC web page (http://www.shfcenter.org/rpc/2013/meeting-materials) for more details.

The recommendation approval process used the sticky wall to allow for a broader range of RPC member responses to the committee recommendations by individual grantee.
**Capital Adoptive Families Alliance**
The Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee recommended approval, with no requested follow up.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>1: Strong Agreement</th>
<th>2: Agreement with Minor Concerns</th>
<th>3: Agreement with Reservations</th>
<th>4: Stand Aside</th>
<th>5: Disagreement with Major Concern</th>
<th>6: Strong Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve Progress Report</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**United Iu-Mien Community**
The Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee recommended approval, with follow up, which includes:

- During the January 2014 site visit conducted by the Program Officer, a clarification question is asked to determine how mental health topics are facilitated in each of the support groups’ ongoing discussions.

Q. Did they talk about calls – were there referrals made?
A. There were referrals made but some were related to housing and other concerns rather than mental health issues. There is an education element in letting people know about the value of a hotline versus a resource line.

**Dialogue**
Two RPC members voiced minor reservations about the hotline. Concerns were expressed in regard to the community utilization of the hotline.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>1: Strong Agreement</th>
<th>2: Agreement with Minor Concerns</th>
<th>3: Agreement with Reservations</th>
<th>4: Stand Aside</th>
<th>5: Disagreement with Major Concern</th>
<th>6: Strong Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve Progress Report</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Edward Lewis arrived late and did not participate in this vote.*
Del Oro Caregiver Resource Center

The Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee recommended approval with follow up, which includes:

- The Center Program Officer will schedule a meeting with the new Del Oro Executive Director by the end of December 2013 to provide an orientation on the respite services contract.
- Next steps may be determined dependent on the outcome of the meeting.

Q: What is the organization’s plan on getting caregivers to fill out depression scale?
A: Currently, surveys are being mailed out. There is an initial screening process to determine if someone is at risk and in need of respite services.

Q: Is there a baseline for hospitalizations?
A: Not at this point.

Q: How do we know that they’re using the funds for people with mental health issues to avert crisis rather than people with Alzheimer’s?
A: Respite support is funded for caregivers, not Alzheimer’s patients.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>1: Strong Agreement</th>
<th>2: Agreement with Minor Concerns</th>
<th>3: Agreement with Reservations</th>
<th>4: Stand Aside</th>
<th>5: Disagreement with Major Concern</th>
<th>6: Strong Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve Progress Report</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dialogue

Following the initial vote, Deb Marois, Facilitator, Converge CRT, opened the floor for additional dialogue for RPC members to explain reservations and concerns. RPC members voiced concerns around funding for the population, CES-D depression scale completion, and high funding for an organization with a small number of unduplicated clients. However, RPC members also noted that the importance of acknowledging that Scopes of Work were approved in May 2012; organization funding should not be delayed based on previously agreed upon issues. Evaluation activities through American Institutes for Research will focus on respite services provided; not survey responses.

Deb Marois, Facilitator, Converge CRT, suggested utilizing the decision making provision that allows for a yes, no, or stand aside vote to be taken if there is a lack of consensus on a time-sensitive issue.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Stand Aside</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve Progress Report</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Turning Point Community Programs
The Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee recommended approval with follow up, which includes:
- Turning Point provide data on client utilization of resources if the agency has the capacity to provide that data.
- Turning Point provide an update on staff trainings at the January site visit, which will be conducted by the Center Program Officer.
- Turning Point develop an action plan to address the translation of program materials as identified in the scope of work.

Iffat Hussain and Alexis Bernard, RPC Members, have a conflict of interest and left the room for the duration of the discussion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>1: Strong Agreement</th>
<th>2: Agreement with Minor Concerns</th>
<th>3: Agreement with Reservations</th>
<th>4: Stand Aside</th>
<th>5: Disagreement with Major Concern</th>
<th>6: Strong Disagreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approve Progress Report</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All progress reports were approved by the RPC, which releases 20% of grant awards per grantee. Myel thanked everyone for their work. The next round of Round 1 Progress Report Recommendations will be reviewed at the April RPC meeting.

Funding Availability for Round 3
Myel Jenkins, Program Officer, Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management, discussed funding availability for Round 3. Myel outlined funding allocated so far in Round 1 and Round 2. Round 3 funding is estimated to be about $775,000. It is important to note that Round 3 is the last round of community grants for the RPC project, and will be distributed before the project ends in June 2016. There will be additional discussion on this topic at the all-day February RPC meeting.

Q. Is there a plan for sustainability?
A: After dinner, the Sustainability and Public Policy Committee will be posing sustainability questions for discussion. Based on RPC member feedback, the committee will develop a sustainability plan for consideration.

Working Dinner & Dialogue: Sustainability
Shadi Barfjani, RPC member representing the Sustainability and Policy Committee, introduced the questions for the Sustainability and Policy discussion. RPC members were asked to take notes and return to the Center at the end of the meeting. These notes will assist the Sustainability and Policy Committee to determine next steps for the sustainability plan. The Sustainability and Policy questions included:
1. What is the Respite Partnership Collaborative’s role? Is it a grantmaking entity? Is it an advocacy, education and/or outreach entity around respite?
2. What is the Respite Partnership Collaborative’s relevance? What specific benefit does the Respite Partnership Collaborative deliver? What makes the Respite Partnership Collaborative uniquely different from anything else?

3. What would be the sustainability strategy to maintain Respite Partnership Collaborative funded programs going forward?

Following discussion within small groups, RPC members discussed the questions as a large group. Important discussion points included:

**Role**
- Educate community about respite in relation to Mental Health Services Act (MHSA)**
- Marketing has been limited – time pressure, new, focus on granting**
- Outreach and education to grow respite services. Increase awareness. No other respite advocacy in community

**Relevance**
- Community engagement is unique – beyond usual mental health. Provides out of the box thinking**
- Private/public/community partnership*
- Learning how different cultures view mental health and respite*
- Respite services are different than usual models – get a break and receive support services. Focus on respite. Provides model for other grantmaking efforts***
- Filling gaps in mental health services

**Funding Services**
- More likely with community support. Engage more interested stakeholders – parent advocacy groups (UACF)**
- Transition of RPC – Steering Committee/Advisory Board*
- Engage celebrities in issue – fundraise, help (mental health is on their agenda)*
- Explore fee for services, billable through Medi-Cal
- Engage politicians with lived mental health experience or on agenda
- Link to healthcare reform

**Updates and Next Steps**
Shadi Barfjani, RPC Member representing the Sustainability and Policy Committee, reminded RPC members about the upcoming RPC Community Stakeholder meeting on Thursday, January 16, from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m. This meeting will highlight newly funded respite services, and invite community members to discuss respite, as well as a panel discussion with hospital system, law enforcement and secondary education representatives.

Iffat Hussain, Chair, RPC Membership and Governance Committee thanked RPC members for their attendance and collaboration in 2013, and reminded RPC members that participation in the RPC is an asset to the collaborative. She reminded members that if you cannot make a meeting, please get the information from the on-line Dropbox at http://bit.ly/RPCMaterials, and feel free to reach out to RPC Membership and Governance Committee members for
assistance. As a reminder, if there are three regularly scheduled meetings missed within a six month period, members are encouraged to discuss their participation with the RPC Membership and Governance Committee in order to respect the time commitment of other members. Additionally, please remember to review the packet and materials before each meeting. Iffat encouraged members to attend Coffee Talk before the meeting to discuss meeting materials with other RPC members.

Myel thanked everyone for attending the meeting and acknowledged the accomplishments of the past year, including funding three new grantees and establishing a collaborative governance structure. Myel thanked RPC members for their commitment and wished the membership happy holidays.

The next RPC meeting is the RPC Community Stakeholder meeting on Thursday, January 16, from 1 p.m. to 3 p.m.