RPC Meeting Summary – March 11, 2014

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. Spring is a time of renewal, and project renewal is a strong theme of the RPC as the RPC determines Round 3 funding.

Ebony Chambers and David Schroeder, RPC Co-Chairs welcomed everyone to the meeting and reviewed the meeting goals and ground rules.

Myel Jenkins reviewed the Grantee Learning Community Meeting on February 28th. This meeting focused on sustainability, and grantees shared updates on the progress of their programs. Myel encouraged RPC members to attend future Grantee Learning Community meetings; they are a rich opportunity to hear from grantees and learn about their programs. Myel also reviewed meeting materials, and asked RPC members to review the Conflict of Interest Policy and the Incentives Policy. These documents are formalized versions of already existing RPC practices.

Deb Marois, Facilitator, Converge CRT, welcomed everyone to the March meeting.

AIR Evaluation Update
Leslie Cooksy, Evaluation Director, Sierra Health Foundation, reviewed the performance measures document, and introduced Grace Wang, Project Director, American Institutes for Research. Refer to the PowerPoint presentation AIR Progress Report Presentation on the RPC web page (http://sierrahealth.org/assets/AIR_Progress_Report_Presentation_030414.pdf) for more details.

Q: What pools do you draw from the community member surveys and interviews?
A: Community members came from adult mental health providers, MHSA Steering Committee, and Mental Health Board members. For the community member interviews, Myel Jenkins and Leslie Cooksy advised on community members whose stakeholder perspectives were absent from the RPC, or representatives from organizations who could have applied for funding but have not.

Q: How was the decision made to only include adult providers in the survey?
A: Division of Behavioral Health Services made this decision.

Deb Marois, Facilitator, Converge CRT, asked RPC members to discuss how the information from the presentation impacts the last phase of the Innovation project and the funding strategy for Round 3? Important discussion points included:
The community survey was targeted primarily to providers/policy makers. There are different levels of awareness as far as the project and services.

Providers surveyed only included adult mental health providers. One RPC member voiced concern that Children’s providers were not included in the survey.

Not many consumers/family members participated in survey – unless they were connected to the MHSA Steering Committee or Mental Health Board.

RPC members suggested that for future surveys RPC members be consulted on who to contact for the community survey.

It may be too early to determine if RPC members feel comfortable stating whether the RPC is or is not essential to respite services.

Awareness of other funding opportunities could influence the design of Round 3.

How can we leverage existing funds or data and work together with grantees to support sustainability efforts? For example, hire a grant writer. There is more power as a group. The RPC could be educated on funding opportunities, for example from SAMSHA or HHS and then share this info with grantees.

Surprised that so many RPC members feel Sierra Health Foundation has so much influence. The RPC needs to determine how to move forward with more balance. Ensuring active participation of members during meetings is one suggestion.

**Round 1 Grantee Site Visit Reports and Recommendations**

*Lyn Corbett, Chair, Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee* presented the Round 1 Year 2 Site Visit Reports. Please refer to the PowerPoint presentation *Round 1 Year 2 Site Visit Report Presentation* on the RPC web page here: [http://sierrahealth.org/assets/RPC_Round_1_Year_2_Site_Visit_Reports.pdf](http://sierrahealth.org/assets/RPC_Round_1_Year_2_Site_Visit_Reports.pdf)

The Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee recommended approval of all Round 1 Year Site Visit Reports. The RPC unanimously approved this recommendation. The remaining 20% of funding will be released for all Round 1 grantees. Myel will let Round 1 grantees know their programs have been funded for the final 20% of funding, and share with Round 1 grantees the need for stakeholder input on their programs, particularly if the programs are refunded for Round 3.

RPC members discussed the need to consider Round 1 successes, challenges and lessons learned when planning Round 3. In particular, what grantees have learned about the delivery of respite services, organizational capacity, and the definition of respite.

**Membership and Governance Committee Announcement**

The *Membership and Governance Committee* presented a PowerPoint Presentation to RPC members on the 2014-2015 Membership Term. The committee requested that all RPC members respond to the committee with membership intentions by March 17th. Refer to the PowerPoint presentation *Membership and Governance Committee Presentation* here: [http://sierrahealth.org/assets/RPC_Membership_and_Governance_PPT.pdf](http://sierrahealth.org/assets/RPC_Membership_and_Governance_PPT.pdf)
Continued Development of Round 3 Funding Strategy
RPC members divided into two groups to discuss the continued development of Round 3 funding strategies. Group A discussed strategies for refunding Round 1 grantees, and Group B discussed strategies for developing a RFP for respite services for un/underserved cultural populations. Following the small group discussions, the groups presented on their strategies for Group A and Group B discussions. Important discussions from each group included:

Group A Highlights (Refund Round 1 Grantees):
- Recommend refunding for all Round 1 grantees
- Ask for a letter of interest to opt in for Round 3 funding.
- The Grantmaking and Evaluation Committee will determine a team who will work with grantees to develop a Round 3 budget and Scope of Work. This team will develop criteria for the letter of interest, budget and Scope of Work.
- This group would schedule in-person meetings with grantees after April 28th when the final Round 1 Progress Reports are due.
- The group identified learnings to apply including: Keep it simple; Use subsets of committee members; Look for similarities in challenges; Provide a template to respond to

Group B Highlights (Respite Services for Un/Underserved Populations)
- Time constraints – questions about organizational capacity to ramp up in one year.
- There is a focus on learning – what is respite within the context of cultural communities? We’ve learned the RPC definition did not align with their proposals.
- We need to decide – are we going to pursue this strategy?
- Consider one-year learning grants to determine what is respite for specific communities
- Re-consider – ask Round 1 grantees to address cultural populations if within their capacity.
- Consider funding smaller groups and providing technical assistance to apply for grants and roll-out services
- Help groups through application process
- Utilize the County Cultural Competency Plan to inform the RPC of underserved populations
- Continue to discuss in April; Planning Committee will structure this process.

Announcements and Next Steps
The Membership and Governance Committee reminded all RPC members to confirm their 2014-2015 membership intentions by March 17th. Myel thanked all RPC members for their meeting participation and for their willingness to dive into tough conversations surrounding Round 3 funding. This work will continue to have an impact in the community.

The next RPC meeting is Tuesday, April 1, from 3 p.m. to 6:30 p.m.