Respite Partnership Collaborative (RPC) Meeting Summary – March 1, 2016

Welcome and Opening Remarks
Alexis Bernard, RPC Co-Chair, opened the meeting, welcomed members and guests, reviewed ground rules and led a round of introductions.

Michelle Saeteurn, RPC Co-Chair welcomed Frank Topping back to the RPC, thanked Alexis Bernard for her service as co-chair and congratulated Iffat Hussain on her transition from member-at-large to co-chair. She announced that the member-at-large position is open. An e-mail will go out by the end of this week for self-nominations.

Michelle reviewed the evaluation summary from the February 2, 2016, meeting, reviewed the values of the RPC and shared the goals for the day:
- Report out from February 18 Grantee Learning Community Meeting
- Review and Action of Sacramento LGBT Community Center Teens/TAY Annual Report Review
- RPC member discussion on RPC goals, member roles and potential next steps

Iffat Hussein, RPC Co-chair, provided a report from the February Grantee Learning Community Meeting, which was the final grantee learning community meeting of the project. At the meeting grantees demonstrated their eagerness to discuss and learn from each other's experiences with a heartfelt discussion. The meeting embodied the goals of a successfully facilitated collaboration.

Updates
MHSA Steering Committee Round 3 Funding
Alex Trac, DBHS representative, reported that at the February Mental Health Services Act (MHSA) Steering Committee meeting, the Division of Behavioral Health Services (DBHS) recommended both of the Sacramento LGBT Community Center’s respite programs for continued MHSA funding, as they qualified for consideration based on the progress reports.

Reflections on the Community-driven Process
Iffat facilitated a reflection for the RPC of what has gone well, what could be improved and what has been learned from the community-driven process.

Discussion highlights:
- RPC has successfully conducted work in a community-driven fashion with diverse perspectives and consumers at the table.
- Members are willing to examine the process, make changes, and improve with internal and external evaluation.
• RPC members have donated countless hours to change lives of clients, build relationships and create and strengthen a network of providers.
• RPC acknowledged importance of Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management’s (CHPM) private/ public partnership with DBHS.
• RPC has helped humanize mental health clients, helped strengthen client-centered services, and engaged community and mental health stakeholders.
• Members would have liked a more defined and clear relationship with MHSA Steering Committee.
• Members acknowledged that RPC recruitment and retention was challenging.
• Members would like to ensure the networking, collaboration and shared learning continues among respite providers and non-grantee providers.
• Members learned about the need to address cultural competence in service provisions.

Review and Action: Round 3 Teens and TAY Annual Reports

Kim Maslaniak, Director of Operations, Sierra Health Foundation: Center for Health Program Management and Alexis provided the following context:

• The report is being reviewed pursuant to the terms of the grant agreement.
• This report, covering December 2014 to December 2015, is the final action report from the Sacramento LGBT Community Center.
• Sacramento LGBT Community Center progress reports were approved by the RPC in February 2016.
• RPC approval of this report releases 10% of the grant award (final payment)-$10,098.80.

Myel presented a summary of the report:

• The Sacramento LGBT Community Center met or surpassed several performance measure targets demonstrating progression and staff recommendation is to approve the report.
• There are two performance measures that have not been met, which have come to the RPC’s attention in previous reports.
• They have only been able to track unduplicated clients since mid-August and are reporting 150 total unduplicated clients served – 100 served in the drop-in center and 50 served through youth groups. The group target was to serve 150 unduplicated clients, this difference between the target and actual is addressed in the narrative.
• They have a high number of youth who are coming back for services, which was unanticipated.

Kay Temple-Kirk excused herself from discussion and decision-making due to any perceived conflict of interest.

Discussion:
A number of clarifying questions were asked regarding the Sacramento LGBT Community Center contracts and release of payment. DBHS and CHPM staff answered questions as follows:

• DBHS informed the RPC that the MHSA Steering Committee has requested that DBHS review the process through which the decision to terminate the contracts was made.
That review is under way now, and may take 60 days or more. Once the review is complete and a report has been made to the MHSA Steering Committee, DBHS will help set a date for the end of the contract.

- RPC members expressed interest in being a resource during this review process.
- CHPM staff informed the RPC that while this review is pending, CHPM still has to move forward with the contract terms.
- A vote approving the report would trigger the release of funding.

The collaborative discussed the RPC’s previous votes to terminate the Sacramento LGBT Community Center’s respite contracts. Based on these prior votes, the RPC moved to not discuss the Teens and TAY final report.

Vote:
Do you wish to not vote on the Sacramento LGBT Community Center final report?

Yes: 9
No: 0
Abstain: 0
Conflict of interest: 1

**RPC Moving Forward: RPC Goals, Member Roles and Collaborative Next Steps**

*Michelle* facilitated a process through which the RPC members identified their desired project legacy. The following themes emerged from RPC members and will be revisited at the next meeting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Successful projects</th>
<th>Community-driven process</th>
<th>Education/Outreach</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful projects that will continue beyond the RPC</td>
<td>Innovation on community-driven process</td>
<td>Hope for future educational efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respite care services in Sacramento provide a model to all</td>
<td>Sharing models of Mental Health respite</td>
<td>Consult information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inclusiveness</td>
<td>The start of mental health respite services in Sacramento</td>
<td>Continued needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>Holding up a community-driven process even in difficult times</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A community definition of respite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community collaboration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing pattern of community action to overcome obstacles to mental health respite care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps: At the RPC April meeting, we will continue to discuss the RPC legacy.

Summary and Next Steps
Michelle led the closing of the meeting.

Reflection of today’s meeting:
It felt like a team today.

Agenda items for next meetings:
Planning for the legacy of the RPC
How the learning is being summed up and presented, by who and when.
Does RPC want to continue beyond the RPC project term?

Thinking ahead to the Community Stakeholder Meeting
Before the April meeting, think about what we want for the May Community Stakeholder Meeting.

Future Meetings
April 5, 2016, 3 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.
May 3, 2016, 3 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.
June 7, 2016, 3 p.m. - 6:30 p.m.