Respite Partnership Collaborative Meeting Summary – February 2, 2016

Welcome, Introduction and Opening Remarks

Michelle Saeteurn, RPC Co-chair opened the meeting, welcomed members and guests, led a round of introductions, reviewed the ground rules and values of the RPC and shared the goals of the meeting, which included:
- Sacramento LGBT Community Center presentation
- Restorative conversation
- Review and determine action of Round 3 grantees

Sacramento LGBT Community Center Presentation

Iffat Hussein, RPC Member-at-Large welcomed bel Reyes and Brit Irby of Innovation Bridge, facilitators for the presentation, discussion and decision making.

Sacramento LGBT Community Center Representatives, Carlos Marquez, Board President and Poshi Michaelson spoke on behalf of the Sacramento LGBT Community Center. For details of the presentation, please see the PowerPoint provided by the Sacramento LGBT Community Center.

The following points are not included in the PowerPoint:
- Sacramento LGBT Community Center is in the final stages of discussion with APIQ Sacramento Steering Committee to finalize the details of the community forums with the APIQ and broader community.
- They recognize that community resources are not a service that lends itself to duplicated services. This information will inform future program planning and goal development.

Respite Partnership Collaborative members asked several programmatic questions that were answered by Sacramento LGBT Community Center staff and board members.

Restorative Conversation

Diane Littlefield, Vice President of Programs and Partnerships, Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management set the context for the discussion and articulated the role of Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management in the conversation. She pointed out that the RPC is an Innovation Project focused on learning and has always operated in a transparent and fair manner.

This restorative discussion was an open dialogue for the RPC members, Sacramento LGBT Community Center representatives and other guests.
RPC Consensus Decision Making and Action
Brit and bel facilitated the decision making process. Kay Temple Kirk and Erica Fonseca, Round 3 grantee staff members and RPC members, stepped out of the meeting due to perceived conflict of interest during this decision making process. RPC members asked contract management questions at this time to inform their decision making.

Straw Poll 1: Does the RPC want to hold another vote on the LGBT Center funding?
• Yes means that it will start an official vote: Do you want to reinstate the Sacramento LGBT Community Center’s contracts?
• No means there will be no official vote and the status of the contract will not change.

Straw Poll 1 results:
No: 5
Yes: 4
Abstain: 1

RPC members discussed the reasons to hold or not hold another vote.
Straw poll 2: Does the RPC want to hold another vote on the Sacramento LGBT Community Center’s funding?
Straw poll 2 results with insights from the consensus wall and discussion:
Yes: 6
No: 3, all strong disagreement from the consensus wall
Abstain: 1

The RPC discussed that consensus was not reached through the prior vote and a member proposed to have a vote on the question: Do you want to reinstate the Sacramento LGBT Community Center contracts? Members agreed to move forward with the vote using the consensus wall.

Vote via consensus wall: Do you want to reinstate Sacramento LGBT Community Center’s contracts?
• Yes means the funding will be reinstated through the original timeline
• No means the contract will not change and will be terminated as scheduled

Vote via consensus wall results:
4 yes
4 no
1 maybe
1 abstain

Vote: Do you want to reinstate Sacramento LGBT Community Center’s Contracts?
Consensus wall results:
Strong Agreement: 3
Agree with minor concern: 1
Support with reservation: 1
Stand aside: 0
Disagree with major concern: 0
Strong disagreement: 5

Per RPC policy, consensus wall agreement states that if one person is in strong disagreement to the proposal, there is not a consensus and the proposal does not move forward.

Decision: Consensus was not reached and the prior vote from December was upheld.
Review and Action: Round 3 Reports

Wind Youth Services

Iffat facilitated the process of review and decision making on the Wind Youth Services Annual Report which, if approved, would release the final 10% of the contract amount. Erica Fonseca stepped out due to conflict of interest as a Wind Youth Services staff and RPC member.

Myel presented a summary of the report.

- Target is 700 unduplicated clients for contract period, year-end actuals for 12 months is 918.
- The target for youth reporting feeling physically safe is 90%, actual reports is 100%.
- Challenge with translating materials to Spanish that they will correct by March.
- Noted in their narrative an acknowledgement of the impact of the course correction requested previously in the contract period.

Discussion:

- Wind changed their hours of operation and protocols to make the services more responsive to youth needs.

Straw Poll: Does the RPC approve the report for Wind Youth Services to release funding?

Yes: 8
No: 0
Stand aside: 1

Decision: The report and release of the final 10% was approved.

Sacramento LGBT Community Center

Diane Littlefield shared that the Sacramento LGBT Community Center’s past progress reports were being presented to the RPC for review and action. The reports were presented to the RPC at the December meeting but the RPC did not take an action vote on the Teens and TAY follow-up report or the Un/Underserved progress report. If approved, the reports would release funding for services the Sacramento LGBT Community Center completed prior to the RPC vote to discontinue their funding.

Iffat facilitated the process of review and decision making on the LGBT Center Round 3 Teens and TAY and the Un/Underserved Reports.

Myel presented a summary of the follow-up report capturing Teens and TAY services from September to October.

- Report captured 75 unduplicated youth and 746 visits in the two-month report period.
- The report also continues to show high number of unduplicated visits.
- There is an increase in the number of survey completed in comparison to the last report period.
- A total of 88 group sessions were completed in 10 months.
- At the current trajectory, the LGBT Center would complete 136 groups, which is under the contract term target of 170.

Straw Poll: Does the RPC approve the Sacramento LGBT Community’s Center Teens and TAY report?

Yes: 11
No: 0
Myel presented a summary of the Un/Underserved report.

- A total of 111 unduplicated clients were served in this report period; the total served between the two reporting period is 366.
- The contract target is to serve 500 unduplicated clients. They are currently at 73% of that goal.
- The way the data is reported it is unclear if these numbers account for group participants.
- The Center is on track with most performance measures.

Straw Poll: Does the RPC approve the Sacramento LGBT Community Center’s Un/Underserved Report?
Yes: 11
No: 0

Decision: Both reports were approved and funding will be released.

Grantee Learning Community Meeting
The meeting is February 18. All members are invited to nominate RPC members to speak at the meeting.

Closing
The next meeting is March 1, 2016, at 3:00 p.m.