

Chat:

Hilarie Hauptman: Can you hear me, Hilarie Hauptman from WA State

Hilarie Hauptman: Great

KenYada: KenYada Washington, Mississippi

Hilarie Hauptman: I agree with you Jill on the definition of stakeholder.

Vicki Clear: Is this just caregivers receiving respite through the grant or from all sources of respite?

Hilarie Hauptman: Should I assume that this relates to all respite services (sorry if I did not catch this). I would also agree with Greg that resources may not be equal from state to state.

Hilarie Hauptman: You bet

Vicki Clear: For us, I think it would be those agencies or organizations that refer to us.

Meghan Kluth: We could try to collect that data from organizations in Colorado but I don't have faith that we'd get full participation.

Hilarie Hauptman: Individual respite staff would be trickier for our state as we utilize lots of home care agencies, etc. and currently not individual providers.

Vicki Clear: Definitely difficult

Deana Prest: yes we would struggle in NY

Sharon Johnson, NE: WE don't capture caregivers on waiting lists but rather collect "individuals"

Hilarie Hauptman: This will be tricky knowing exactly the reason why someone on waiting list: funding may be another reason, lack of available vouchers or respite slots.

Nadine Walter: Can you repeat the indicators

Hilarie Hauptman: Can we be sent the ppt as well?

Hilarie Hauptman: I now see it, thank you!

Christine Schoenberger: Thank you!

Polling

2.1: The number of stakeholders who actively promote, fund, provide, or otherwise support respite services.

Knowing that we will never have perfect numbers—would you be able to collect data on this indicator?

Yes 18.1% (2 votes)

Yes, with support 63.6% (7 votes)

No 18.1% (2 votes)

How valuable would it be to you to have this information?

1 --Not valuable 18.1% (2 votes)

2--Neutral 45.4% (5 votes)

3--Valuable 36.3% (4 votes)

2.2: The external resources used for sustaining the LR program.

Knowing that we will never have perfect numbers—would you be able to collect data on this indicator?

Yes 61.5% (8 votes)

Yes, with support 23% (3 votes)

No 15.3% (2 votes)

How valuable would it be to you to have this information?

1 --Not valuable 7.14% (1 vote)

2--Neutral 28.5% (4 votes)

3--Valuable 64.2% (9 votes)

2.3 The number of caregivers receiving respite.

Knowing that we will never have perfect numbers—would you be able to collect data on this indicator?

Yes	23% (3 votes)
Yes, with support	38.4% (5 votes)
No	38.4% (5 votes)

How valuable would it be to you to have this information?

1 –Not valuable	0%
2--Neutral	7.69% (1 vote)
3--Valuable	92.3% (12 votes)

2.4 Organizations/agencies that connect caregivers with a single point of contact for respite information and services.

Knowing that we will never have perfect numbers—would you be able to collect data on this indicator?

Yes	8.33% (1 vote)
Yes, with support	75% (9 votes)
No	16.6% (2 votes)

How valuable would it be to you to have this information?

1 –Not valuable	0%
2—Neutral	0%
3--Valuable	100% (12 votes)

2.5 The number of respite providers available.

Knowing that we will never have perfect numbers—would you be able to collect data on this indicator?

Yes	25% (3 votes)
Yes, with support	16.6% (2 votes)
No	58.3% (7 votes)

How valuable would it be to you to have this information?

1 –Not valuable	7.69% (1 vote)
2--Neutral	15.3% (2 votes)
3--Valuable	76.9% (10 votes)

2.6 The number of caregivers on waiting lists or turned away due to a lack of appropriate providers.

Knowing that we will never have perfect numbers—would you be able to collect data on this indicator?

Yes	0%
Yes, with support	0%
No	100% (10 votes)

How valuable would it be to you to have this information?

1 –Not valuable	36.3% (4 votes)
2--Neutral	0%
3--Valuable	63.6% (7 votes)