



Portfolio Review Committee Agenda

July 16 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.

490 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, SCTA Conference 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, Minutes ACTION ITEM**
Review and approve May minutes

- 1:05 Updates & Reports**
Update on portfolio activity since last meeting, reviewing renewals

- 1:15 Applications to the Portfolio ACTION ITEM**
READY – Human Services Department
Items in questions: Literature Review, Policies and Procedures

- 1:45 Bylaws – ACTION ITEM**
Review edits

- 2:00 Literature Reviews – DISCUSSION ITEM**
Should organizations submitting multiple literature reviews also submit a summary?

- 2:20 Tier Division Recommendations – DISCUSSION ITEM**

- 3:00 Adjourn**

Upcoming Meetings

September 17, 2014 October 15, 2014 November 19, 2014 December 24, 2014

All meetings will be held from 1:00 – 3:00 pm



Wednesday, May 21, 2014 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
 Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
 Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way
 Karin Demarest, Community Foundation
 Kate Pack, First 5
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
 Leo Tacata, District Attorney’s Office
 Monique Chapman, Sheriff’s Office
 Rebecca Wachsberg, Probation Department
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department
 Stephen Jackson, SCOE

Staff (listed alphabetically)

Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services Department
 Cynthia King, Human Services Department
 Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
 Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa

Public (listed alphabetically)

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting
 Juan Hernandez, La Luz
 Kara Reyes, La Luz
 Ulla Mast, Department of Health Services

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, Updates	Angie welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions. Motion to approve the minutes. Cynthia provided an update of recent technical assistance and programs added to the Portfolio.	Motion to approve the minutes: Jennifer Second: Carlos Yes: 11 No: 0 Abstain: 0	None
Application to the Portfolio	La Luz – Triple P Items for discussion: Missing fidelity measures <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Session-by-session guides • Other quality assurance processes including access to practitioner’s website, technical assistance and consultation for organizations, quality assurance processes for trainers, and level 4 coordinator’s website. Rob thanked La Luz for their application and for participating in the review processes. He	Motion to approve La Luz as an implementer of Triple P. Motion: Jennifer Second: Carlos Yes : 11 No: 0	La Luz will be included as a Triple P implementer in the Upstream Portfolio.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>articulated that this was a very strong application, however when compared to the requirements listed on the California Evidence Based Clearinghouse he was concerned that the fidelity measures listed above were missing. Rob read the specific requirements as they are articulated on the California Evidence Based Clearinghouse. His greatest concern was for the use of protocol checklists.</p> <p>Kate felt this was a strong application and that some of the things missing were access issues. The application specifies that standard forms are used which implies that La Luz has the necessary website access.</p> <p>Discussion: The discussion of support groups in the application suggests that they have quality processes in place. The information is in the Adherence section instead of the Quality section.</p> <p>Public Comment: Juan thanked the committee and described the implementation of Triple P at La Luz. Kara provided specific information on the use of session-by-session guides, website access, technical assistance and consultation, quality assurance for trainers, and the use of coordinator’s website. She confirmed that even though they were not spelled out in the application all of these measures were consistently used/practiced.</p> <p>Discussion: Rob – I had no knowledge that these things were happening. Can we recommend that the application be amended an approved? Jennifer – I move that we recommend the program for Tier 1. Carlos - I want to commend both reviewers. It can be difficult not to approve a program and reading between the lines and getting down to the nitty gritty is challenging but necessary. I would hope that the bar for Triple P and the Tier 1 programs be consistently raised. I second Jennifer’s motion. Motion passed.</p> <p>Summary: La Luz was approved as an implementer of Triple P Positive Parenting.</p>	Abstain: 0	
Tier 2 Impact	<p>1:25 B.J. arrived</p> <p>How do we define “significant impact?” What is the level of impact we require for a Tier 2 program?</p> <p>Discussion: Score sheets require that the evaluation “suggests positive outcomes.”</p>	None	Staff will make recommendations for alternate Tier divisions and for language to help Tier

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Is there something in the logic model that shows a long term impact? Can research be done on what clearinghouses expect?</p> <p>This is a difficult discussion without context. The context and rigor of research are critical. Without statistical measure this is at the reviewer’s discretion. In some cases a 2% change may be enough. In others, maybe not. We would like to think that as we move into evidence based practice we would use science to inform this decision. What should follow is training on how to do this.</p> <p>Maybe we should divide Tier 2 into those that have rigor and those that are still learning.</p> <p>Even if we use science to inform our decisions there will still be a large margin for subjectivity. Some outcomes show strong change, others less. How do I decide which ones are relevant? There is a large margin for subjectivity based on individual programs. Maybe we need a set of guidelines based on approved programs.</p> <p>If Tier 2 can include a P value that’s great, but I would be hesitant to require that. Many organizations will not have the capacity or software to do that. There should be rational around why we should accept small improvements and it should be rooted in the literature. Without adding burden for finding quantitative literature I think we may need to accept any positive change.</p> <p>TA should include what a good qualitative and quantitative study is. You can calculate P value online; we need to help people understand what that is.</p> <p>We need to remember that we are a small county built of small programs. Statistical significance is a good standard but there are other ways to articulate the importance of a good outcome. This is a learning process for our community.</p> <p>I think we need to require that they make a case about why their impact is important. Applications should show why something is meaningful. If we’re thinking about investors in the community we want them to invest soundly.</p> <p>Donors consistently ask what is the impact and how are they measuring it? What can we do to help the organizations tell their story?</p> <p>Moving Schools of Hope from Tier 3 to Tier 2 was a major victory, but we didn’t have a way to articulate this to our Board. They already thought it was enough to be on the Portfolio. Maybe we need a clearer definition of Tier 2 or a division of Tier 2? Some donors distinguish between strong evaluations and weak or learning evaluations.</p> <p>We could also benefit from distinguishing between Tier 2’s that are on a clearinghouse and Tier 2’s that are not.</p> <p>This is an interesting evolution. In the beginning all an organization needed was an evaluation, not positive outcomes. We should be proponents of rigor, but keep in mind that we’re already</p>		<p>2 programs articulate their outcomes.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>losing some just by requiring logic models and literature reviews.</p> <p>Some research suggests that in mentoring programs it's enough if the child stays the same, if the program prevented their behavior from getting worse.</p> <p>We need to encourage self-reflection for program development.</p> <p>We should ask them to make their case, to tell their story and then include those stories on the website.</p> <p>We should host learning circles focused on evaluation.</p> <p>If people are reporting qualitative data they need to report statistical significance, but that is not the same thing as impact. Effect size is about impact. Asking them to talk about validity of measures is very important. We should raise the bar for Tire 2 renewals. Part of our job is to move the community to raise the bar. They may need to show multiple measures, qualitative and quantitative.</p> <p>Schools of Hope will probably never be Tier 1. Triple P does not advance organizational thinking and practice. Schools of Hope will continue to refine and evolve organizationally. They will change more than an organization implementing a Tier 1 program, but they will never be Tier 1. This is problematic.</p> <p>Could we add a local evaluation addendum for Tier 1 programs?</p> <p>We could split Tier 2 and make it Tier 2 with or without clearinghouse?</p> <p>We could split Tier 1 and make it Tier 1 with or without clearinghouse?</p> <p>If we have a community program that's really working well we should feel as good about that as a program that's been replicated nationwide. We should give them recognition.</p> <p>We should look cautiously about our criteria for Tier 1.</p> <p>We don't want to confuse people, but there should be a requirement for continuous improvement.</p> <p>As staff we try to dispel the feeling that Tier 1 is better than Tier 2.</p> <p>We also need a recommendation for changes/language around Tier 2 and how they talk about their outcomes.</p> <p>Summary: Staff will make recommendations for alternate Tier divisions and for language to help Tier 2 programs articulate their outcomes.</p>		
Public Comment	None at this time.	None	None
Next Meeting/Final Comments	The next meeting will be on June 18 at 520 Mendocino Ave unless there are no applications for review.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 2:30 pm.	None	None



Update Report for the Portfolio Review Committee

July 2014

To date 73 programs have been approved for tier placement on the Portfolio:

Tier 1: 25 programs

87 organizations *implementing* programs on the Portfolio

Tier 2: 28 programs

54 local organizations *funding* programs on the Portfolio

Tier 3: 20 programs

Renewals approved since May 21, 2014

	Approval Date	Program	Tier	Submitting Agency
1	7/9/14	Family Justice Center	2	Family Justice Center
2	6/24/14	Triple P	1	Early Learning Institute
3	6/17/14	Triple P	1	Action Network
4	6/13/14	Triple P	1	Committee on the Shelterless
5	6/3/14	Triple P	1	Catholic Charities
6	6/3/14	Triple P	1	Alternative Family Services
7	5/29/14	Triple P	1	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County
8	5/29/14	Triple P	1	Jewish Family and Children's Services
9	5/22/14	Triple P	1	Sonoma County Behavioral Health
10	5/22/14	Triple P	1	Petaluma People Services

New submissions approved since May 21, 2014

	Approval Date	Program	Tier	Submitting Agency
1	7/7/14	Teen Mentoring	3	Ceres Community Project
2	6/16/14	Functional Family Therapy	1	SAY
3	5/21/14	Triple P	1	La Luz

Activity related to active submissions since May 21, 2014

	Submission Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Activity Date	Status
1	4/18/14	SCENIQ	Pepperwood Preserve	7/9/14	Technical Assistance
2	12/5/13	Neighborhood Listening Project	Listening for a Change	7/9/14	Technical Assistance
3	3/25/14	Algebra Academy	Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce	7/9/14	Awaiting info from applicant
4	6/11/14	Functional Family Therapy	Petaluma People Services	6/26/14	Technical Assistance
5	12/11/13	Girls Circle	Jewish Children and Family Services	6/11/14	Awaiting info from applicant
6	4/14/14	READY	Sonoma County Human Services Department	6/10/14	Committee decision needed

HSD staff also provides assistance to organizations preparing their applications. This assistance is reflected in the following tables.

Renewal T.A. provided to organizations currently included in the Portfolio:

	Expiration Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Activity Date	Status
1	11/20/14	Project Success	SCOE	7/9/14	Technical Assistance
2	2/9/2015	Family Child Care Home Education Network	Children and Family Circle	7/9/14	Technical Assistance
3	9/15/16	Youth and Family Development through Martial Arts	MAYi	7/8/14	Technical Assistance

One on one pre-application TA provided (in person, phone, and/or email) since May 21, 2014

	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Communication
1	TBD	Committee on the Shelterless	Presentation scheduled for 7/24/14
2	Youth Connections	Community Action Partnership	7/9/14
3	Play Therapy	Petaluma People Services Center	7/9/14
4	Supervised Visitation and TBA	Humanidad	7/9/14
5	Imagine YOU	Interactive Medical Clinic Foundation	7/9/14
6	Teachers Acquiring Language Learner Knowledge (TALLK)	SCOE	7/8/14
7	211	Volunteer Center	7/7/14
8	Earn it, Keep it, Save it and School Readiness	United Way	7/7/14
9	The Toolbox Project	Dovetail Learning, Inc.	6/18/14
10	CYO Street Outreach Program	Breakout Prison Outreach	6/17/14
11	Handwriting without Tears	Action Network	6/10/14
12	Literacy Connection	Volunteer Center of Sonoma County	5/23/14

TA provided through Workshops and Presentations

	Date	Title/Topic	Audience	Number of Participants
1	7/8/14	Learning Circle: Literature Reviews	1 st time Portfolio applicants	9
2	7/1/14	Portfolio Application Overview	Catholic Charities staff	10
3	6/13/14	Portfolio Application Overview	Community Action Partnership staff	6
4	6/10/14	Upstream Boot Camp	1 st time and renewing Portfolio applicants	35
5	6/5/14	Upstream Overview	4 th District CBO's	26
6	2/25/14	Upstream Overview	Volunteer Center staff	8
Total participants:				94

Planned Workshops and Presentations

	Date	Title/Topic	Audience
1	7/22/14	Portfolio Application Overview	FY&C contractors and staff
2	7/25/14	Portfolio Application Overview	Committee on the Shelterless staff
3	8/26/14	Learning Circle: Needs Assessment	Sonoma Valley CBOs
4	9/4/14	Collective Impact	CBO's & County Departments
5	9/9/14	Learning Circle: Intro and Fidelity Charts	Portfolio applicants
6	9/11/14	Upstream Overview	Children of Incarcerated Parents Partnership
7	9/16/14	Learning Circle: Logic Models	Portfolio applicants

	Date	Title/Topic	Audience
8	9/18/14	Upstream Overview	3 rd District CBOs
9	9/23/14	Learning Circle: Literature Reviews	Portfolio applicants
10	9/25/14	Needs Based Learning Circle	Sonoma Valley CBOs
11	9/30/14	Learning Circle: Forms, Policies & Procedures, Manual	Portfolio applicants
12	10/7/14	Learning Circle: Evaluation Purpose, Audience, & Questions	Portfolio applicants
13	10/14/14	Learning Circle: Data Collection	Portfolio applicants
14	10/21/14	Learning Circle: Resource Challenges	Portfolio applicants
15	10/23/14	Upstream Overview	Guerneville CBOs
16	10/28/14	Learning Circle: Resource Challenges	Portfolio applicants
17	11/4/14	Learning Circle: Analysis	Portfolio applicants
18	11/6/14	Upstream Overview	Roseland CBOs
19	11/18/14	Learning Circle: Reporting and Dissemination	Portfolio applicants



Summary of Upstream Investments Bylaws Changes

April 11, 2014

1. Cover: Insert word *Portfolio*
2. Cover: Date change for new amended date
3. Footer should reflect new amended date
4. Section I Purpose and Functions.B.2: Insert word *Portfolio*
5. Section I Purpose and Functions.B.3: Description of the Logic Model and reference to it as an appendix, Exhibit A
6. Section II Membership. A.1.c: Change from up to 2 to up to 4 Criminal Justice members
7. Section II Membership. A.1.e: Specifying that this section refers to K-12 education
8. Section II Membership. A.1.f: Change from up to 2 to up to 3 members
9. Section II Membership. A.2.b: Change from 6 per year to as many as needed; Change from 3 to 5 business days
10. Section II Membership. A.2.d: Change from 8 hours to 4 hours
11. Section II Membership. A.3: Addition of the word *staff* and *Portfolio*
12. Section II Membership. B.4: Addition of the word *to serve*
13. Section III Removal and Resignation of Members. A.2: Insert word *Portfolio*; Removal of an unnecessary comma
14. Section III Removal and Resignation of Members. A.3: Change from 3 to 5
15. Section III Removal and Resignation of Members. A.4: Insert word *Portfolio*
16. Section IV Duties of Members. A: Insert word *Portfolio*
17. Section IV Duties of Members. C: Change from 3 to 5
18. Section IV Duties of Members. D: Insert reference to EXHIBITS B and C
19. Section V Meetings and Actions. C: Insert word *Portfolio*
20. Section V Meetings and Actions. D: Insert word *Portfolio*
21. Section V Meetings and Actions. E: Insert word *Portfolio*
22. Section VI Conflict of Interest. A.2: Removal of an unnecessary *A*
23. Section VI Conflict of Interest. A.5: Insert word *Portfolio*
24. Section VII Staff Support.3: Insert word *Portfolio*
25. Section VII Staff Support.4: Insert word *Portfolio*; Indent 4a
26. Section VII Staff Support.5: Insert word *Portfolio*
27. Section VII Staff Support: Section 10 and 11 become 8 and 9 (were misnumbered originally)
28. Section VII Staff Support.10--now 8: Insert *has the option to*; Insert the word *Portfolio*
29. Section VIII Bylaws.B.1: Insert *Portfolio*
30. Section VIII Bylaws. C: Insert *Portfolio*
31. Appendices: Inserted Logic Model as Exhibit A; Changed Exhibits A and B to B and C

[Type text]

Appendices

1. Document Cynthia is revising/creating with B.J.'s input must be titled **Portfolio Review and Decision Process** to match reference to Bylaws I.B.1 (page 2)
2. Make sure the revised **Portfolio Review and Decision Process** mentions that the Human Services Department staff will distribute submissions to the Portfolio to Review Committee members for their review and Tier Placement Recommendation within three (3) working days of program submission (reference made to this on page 9, Section VII Staff Support.4)
3. Exhibit A becomes the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Logic Model
4. Exhibit A becomes Exhibit B
5. Exhibit B becomes Exhibit C