



UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

It is easier to build strong children than to fix broken lives.

Portfolio Review Committee Agenda

October 17th, 2012 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

1202 Apollo Way in the Annadel Room

All supporting documents are available at www.SonomaUpstream.org and at the Board of Supervisors office at 575 Administration Drive, Room 100A, Santa Rosa, CA, during normal business hours. For accessibility assistance with this agenda or supporting documents, please e-mail Info@SonomaUpstream.org or call 707.565.5800.

1:00 Welcome, Introductions, Agenda ACTION ITEM

Approve Minutes

1:10 Reports

Update on portfolio activity since last meeting

Debrief approved applications

1:20 Applications to the Portfolio ACTION ITEM

Scholarship Sonoma County / 10,000 Degrees, Community Foundation -Final Review

2:15 Criteria Revisions ACTION ITEM

None

2:45 Discussion Items

Upstream Champions and process improvement

November meeting date

Portfolio training

3:15 Public comment

3:30 Adjourn

Upcoming Meetings

November 21st, 2012

December 19th, 2012

January 16th, 2013—1202 Apollo Way in the Annadel Room

February 20th, 2013

March 20th, 2013

April 17th, 2013



Wednesday Sept 19, 2012 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 – 3:30 p.m.

3600 Westwind Blvd – Orville Wright Room

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council

Dan Blake, Sonoma County Office of Education

Dr. B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting

Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way of the Wine Country

Julie Sabbag-Maskey, First 5 Sonoma County

Katie Greaves, Human Services Department

Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office

Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department (staff)

Megan Sirna, Human Services Department (staff)

Marla Stuart, Human Services Department (Project Manager)

Robert Judd, Community Foundation

Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa

Stephen Jackson, Sonoma County Office of Education

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes	<p>Motion to approve minutes.</p> <p>Changes to the agenda: We will not be discussing Guiding Good Choices today as we have not received both score sheets for this review.</p> <p>Also, Play Therapy is only a first review and not a final review as stated on the agenda.</p>	<p>Motion: Dan Second: Robert Ayes: 9 Noes: 0 Absent: Julie Abstain: 0</p>	<p>None</p>
Reports	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on the Portfolio from the last meeting: We now have 46 programs, 56 implementers and 31 funders on the Portfolio Debrief of approved applications: Dan Blake stated that he recently reviewed a program called Value in Preschool. It is a program designed to provide scholarships for preschool. This was the easiest review he has done due to the clarity and organization of the application. Report out on the survey of Review Committee members. A survey was sent out to all members after the August meeting to get feedback about how the process is going. Six members responded and their comments were shared with the group. Other comments were invited. Discussion: The group discussed the possibility of having short, optional trainings after each meeting. Staff does not feel that we can switch to having meetings every other month but we can make a commitment to move meetings along as quickly as possible. Review of updated forms. Update about the Cradle to Career launch: Cradle to Career is an initiative that connects all 	<p>None</p>	<p>Report out on survey of workshop participants at the October meeting</p> <p>Develop training</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>segments of the educational continuum with broad community support to improve the educational, economic, and health outcomes for all Sonoma County youth. The launch of this initiative will be September 20th hosted by Community Action Partnership. 25 Portfolio programs which are part of the Cradle to Career continuum will be showcased at this event.</p>		
<p>Applications to the Portfolio</p>	<p>Carol has suggested a new process for discussing applications that staff would like to try:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Announce program name, submitting agency and reviewers. 2. Synopsise the program including goals, implementation and any other details. 3. Ask for recusals. 4. Reviewer 1 states why they felt the criteria were met. 5. Reviewer 2 states why they felt the criteria were not met. 6. Response and dialogue. <p>Play Therapy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Play Therapy was submitted by Petaluma People Services Center for Tier 2 and reviewed by Stephen Jackson and Dan Blake. 2. Play therapy is a structured, theoretically based approach to therapy that builds on the normal communicative and learning processes of children. 3. No recusals. 4. Dan stated it was difficult to find things clarification with staff, while there was no manual for the program, he felt he was able to find the required elements in the application pieces. 5. Stephen stated that we was unable to find a manual and did not see elements of the manual such as staff training, record keeping or evaluation. 6. Dan agreed with Stephen that there was not enough information for the manual. <p>Consensus on no tier placement.</p> <p>State Preschool</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. California State Preschool Program was submitted by 4Cs of Sonoma County for Tier 1 and reviewed by Leo Tacata and Robert Judd. They submitted this program as an adaptation of the Perry Preschool Program. 2. California State Preschool Program aims to provide preschool education to low-income families that is developmentally, culturally, linguistically and age appropriate. 3. Julie recused herself because First 5 Sonoma County provides funding to this program. 4. Robert discussed initial concerns related to fidelity to the model around staff education and how the agency's response that all staff will have B.A.'s by 2030 satisfied this concern. He approved this application for Tier 1 placement. 5. Leo stated that while this program would probably fit well on Tier 2 of the Portfolio, he did not feel it was close enough to the model (Perry Preschool) that is listed on OJJDP. 	<p>Consensus on no tier placement</p> <p>Consensus on no tier placement</p>	<p>None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Specifically, he felt that there had been significant and unacceptable adaption of the format and dosage of parent visits described in the model program.</p> <p>6. Robert agreed that there was an unacceptable adaptation of the parent visits. Consensus on no tier placement.</p> <p>Scholarship Sonoma County / 10,000 Degrees</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scholarship Sonoma County / 10,000 Degrees was submitted by the Community Foundation of Sonoma County for Tier 2 and reviewed by Leo Tacata and Serena Lienau. 2. This program aims to encourage post-secondary accomplishments among low-income students by providing academic, emotional and financial support to participants. 3. Robert recused himself because he works for the applicant agency. Jennifer recused herself because her agency funds and sits on the Board for the applicant program. Stephen recused himself because he works with the applicant on outreach for this program. 4. Serena stated that the application was very comprehensive and easy to follow. 5. Leo stated that he agreed it was a robust application. He identified the following issues: -Three citations were missing from the literature review section. -The evaluation submitted was an executive summary and did not include a literature review. -The literature was not adequately synthesized. <p>Public Comment was made by Lisa Carreno.</p> <p>6. Serena agreed with Leo that those items should be addressed. Consensus on no tier placement.</p>	<p>Consensus on no tier placement</p>	
<p>Criteria Revisions</p>	<p>Motion to approve the removal of HealthySonoma.org from the list of Acceptable Clearinghouses</p> <p>Motion to approve Cochrane Library of Systematic reviews as an acceptable clearinghouse--only when research is graded high quality for the outcomes targeted by the applicant program.</p>	<p>Motion: Jennifer Second: Dan Ayes: 9 Noes: 0 Absent: 0 Abstain: Julie</p> <p>Motion: BJ Second: Serena Ayes: 10 Noes: 0 Absent: 0</p>	<p>.</p>

Topic			
	<p>Motion to approve the removal of Tier 2 and 3 with Clearinghouse applications.</p> <p>We require that for Tier 1, if accreditation is required by the model Applicants should provide evidence that it is not required. We will continue to allow people who are listed on a clearinghouse to apply for Tier 2 rather than Tier 1 if they wish. No motion was taken as this is not a change in our criteria, only a clarification.</p>	Abstain: 0 Motion: Christina Second: Julie Ayes: 10 Noes: 0 Absent: 0 Abstain:0	
Discussion Items	None	None	None
Public Comment	No additional public comments	None	None
Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm.	None	None

Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Schedule
Third Wednesday of Every Month from 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
3600 Westwind Blvd – Orville Wright Room