



1300 17 Street  
 Sacramento, CA 95811  
 (916) 445-1104

**INNOVATION COMMITTEE**  
**Minutes: April 14, 2008 10 to 3 PM**  
**CiMH, Sacramento, CA**

**Attendees:** David Pating, Chair, Kelvin Lee, Facilitator; Members: Charles Dempsey, Geri Esposito, Jim Featherstone, Stacie Hiramoto, Jo Ann Johnson, Mark Ragins, Rachel Guerrero; DMH: Bertha MacDonald, Pamela Vincent, Jan Howland, Jane Laciste; Public: Stephanie Welch, David Young, Tom Trabin, Chuck Anders, Molly from CPCA; OAC staff: Deborah Lee, Greg Griffin, Ann Wangberg

**Telephone Attendees:** Members: Robert Chittenden, Beth Greenwood, Sharon Roth, Sally Zinman

Agenda Item	Discussion	Action	Individual Responsible
<b>Welcome &amp; Introductions</b>	The Chair presented Innovation as a process, not a thing, and proceeded to introductions.		David Pating & Kelvin Lee
<b>Progress update: Resource Paper to Guidelines</b>	<p>The Innovation Resource Paper states the Innovation Committee will discuss the possibility of “focusing on one or more priorities, goals or topics.” DMH awaits this discussion to develop Innovation Guidelines.</p> <p>A focus area is a particular issue, problem or challenge that Innovation funding might address. Different from statewide or regional projects, focus areas could be inserted at various points along the process.</p>		Deborah Lee
<b>Should Innovation Guidelines include focus areas?</b>	Attendees agreed the benefits of focus areas are outweighed by the importance of grassroots input and flexibility for counties. Some commented that the Innovation Resource Paper includes clear guidelines and areas of focus.		David Pating & Kelvin Lee

<p><b>Public Comment</b></p>	<p>The public provided variations on the above theme &amp; stressed the importance of a robust stakeholder/grass roots planning.</p> <p>Some expressed a desire for suggestions for counties to emulate.</p>	<p>No focus areas will be specified.</p>	<p>Deborah Lee</p>
<p><b>DMH &amp; OAC Panel &amp; Discussion &amp; Public Comment</b></p>	<p>DMH shared guideline questions, summarized as:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. What is the problem?</li> <li>2. What is the proposed solution?</li> <li>3. What is the evaluation process?</li> </ol> <p>Other guideline questions were offered, including this nine steps process:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where did the idea come from?</li> <li>2. How are participants chosen?</li> <li>3. Who is collaborating?</li> <li>4. What is the innovation?</li> <li>5. How does it fit with current practice and push learning?</li> <li>6. How is it evaluated?</li> <li>7. How are course corrections made?</li> <li>8. How will learning occur?</li> <li>9. How will it be sustained &amp; integrated?</li> </ol> <p>Overall concerns include funding &amp; time limitations and guidelines weighted toward one or only a few of the stated Innovation principles.</p>		<p>David Pating &amp; Kelvin Lee</p>
<p><b>Next steps, Appreciation &amp; Recommendations</b></p>	<p>Future questions for Innovation Committee:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Fold into other components or Integrated Plan?</li> <li>2. Encourage or demand learning?</li> <li>3. Require improvement of stakeholder process or allow improvement to be the innovation?</li> </ol>	<p>Request that the OAC have the Innovation Committee meet quarterly</p> <p>Provide Guideline draft for review</p>	<p>David Pating</p> <p>Jane Laciste</p>

**Next Meeting: TBD**