



Tuesday Therapy Breakout #4 Collaborating Regionally vs. Pooled Funds

Moderators: Khyle Clute (Iowa) and Tyson Rupnow (Louisiana)

Possible Discussion Points

Meeting Types

- Regional Consortium vs.
- Stand Alone Regional Peer Exchange

Research Consortia

- Larger Projects
- General Synthesis
- Program Admin-only Interests

Consortium into TPFs

- Shared Ideas bigger than one state
- Avoiding Duplicates of Active Projects

Conflict Points

- What isn't working well with Regional Consortia or Pooled Funds

Combined Takeaways from both Sessions

- Meeting Types
 - Value in having region-level peer exchanges, usually called consortiums, though participating doesn't remove the ability for a single state to host additional peer exchanges with whomever for a specific topic.
 - Shared host-state duties and credit.
 - Mix of third-party admin contracts for travel needs-only versus also having third-party moderate and provide write-ups.
- Research Consortiums
 - Mix of hesitation and concern with trying to fund research projects within the consortium. Challenge with another round of asking subject matter experts to vote, those SMEs not being in the room during discussion and selection. Too many ideas, and too big of ideas, for the funding provided.
 - Success when limiting to surveys or synthesis type projects.
- Consortiums into TPFs
 - Room to improve when it comes to sharing not-yet-funded ideas that could or should be pooled funds, active projects that might have regional expansion within a pooled fund as a second phase and avoiding duplication of active projects that could have been shared prior to funding.
- Conflict Points
 - Getting ideas into the right hands from other states to turn ideas into multi-state projects
 - Need increase in broadly applicable communication efforts