



Wednesday, April 15, 2015 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes
 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
 520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Conference Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting
 Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
 Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
 Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
 Karin Demarest, Community Foundation
 Kate Pack, First 5
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
 Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office
 Megan Sirna, Human Services Department
 Rebecca Wachsberg, County Administrator's office
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department

Staff (listed alphabetically)

Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services
 Liz Parra, Human Services Department
 Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
 Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office
 Serena Lienau, Violence Prevention Partnership

Public (listed alphabetically)

None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, Updates	<p>Angie welcomed Megan Sirna to the Portfolio Review Committee. Leo Tacata announced that he would be leaving his position at the District Attorney's Office and would no longer serve on the Committee.</p> <p>Motion to approve the minutes</p>	<p>Motion to approve the minutes: Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	None
Updates & Reports	<p>Joni provided an update of Technical Assistance since the last meeting</p> <p>Angie proposed the idea of having local organizations on the Portfolio share stories of success. Committee members suggested posting success stories on the Upstream website and inviting experts/speakers to discuss how evidence-based practices positively impact organizations.</p>	None	None
Application to the Portfolio – CASA	<p>Court Appointed Special Advocates, Tier 2 Promising Practices Reviewers: Karin and Rob Recusals Leo and B.J.</p>	<p>Motion to recommend technical assistance: Yes: 10 No: 0</p>	Staff will provide TA to impacted organization.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	
	<p>Karin: The literature review met the criteria and aligned with the logic model. The logic model supports the short-term outcomes. There were some evaluations that tracked outcomes rather than outputs, but evaluation 4 aligns with short-term outcomes. The review was completed according to Upstream procedure with no prior programmatic knowledge.</p> <p>Rob: The literature review does not provide the confidence in the outcomes. Specifically, that participants will not re-enter the juvenile justice system. It is not clear in the literature review how services were delivered. There are also discrepancies in the national model as a model for the local programs.</p> <p>The outcomes in the logic model are not supported by the literature review and do not provide confidence in the outcomes.</p> <p>Evaluation 1 and 2 focus on the CASA program at a national level. Evaluation 3 cites the literature review related to outcomes. Evaluation 4 provides solid qualitative research, while evaluation 5 provides an assessment of data collection, but does not provide a basis that the program is effective across multiple cohorts.</p> <p>Staff read a statement on behalf of CASA who was unable to send a representative to attend the meeting.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The logic model should only include short-term outcomes it intends to evaluate. Long term outcomes are not expected to be evaluated. • All long term outcomes listed on the logic model should be clearly articulated in the literature review. <p>Kate made a motion to deny the program to the Portfolio, and recommend CASA submit a revised logic model as a Tier 2 program or submit an evaluation plan as a Tier 3 program. The motion was seconded by Julie.</p>	<p>Abstain: 2</p>	
<p>Application to the Portfolio, Girls Circle</p>	<p>Girls Circle, Tier 2, Promising Practices Reviewers; Katie and Ellen</p>	<p>Motion to approve the application to the Portfolio :</p>	<p>Staff will provide Probation with technical assistance.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Recusals: Leo and Rob</p> <p>Katie: The evaluation is overly reliant on individual quotes and does not address all the outcomes cited in the logic model. The evaluation found positive findings in three outcomes areas. However, the literature review and evaluation demonstrate that this is a promising program with positive outcomes being implemented in Sonoma County.</p> <p>Ellen: The analysis and reporting demonstrated were not robust enough for an evaluation.</p> <p>Staff read a statement on behalf of Probation who was unable to send a representative to the meeting.</p> <p>Probation should revise the logic model to only include short term outcomes that are included in the evaluation or submit an alternate evaluation that provides outcome data for all short-term outcomes listed on the logic model.</p> <p>Carol made a motion to approve the program to the Portfolio. The motion was seconded by Jennifer. The motion failed.</p>	<p>Yes: 4 No: 6 Abstain: 2</p>	
<p>Renewal Standards</p>	<p>This item was tabled until the May meeting.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Literature Review Source Format</p>	<p>Joni informed committee members that there was no requirement for applicants to include a bibliography for literature reviews.</p> <p>Committee members discussed that it was important to be able to refer to sources in a literature review.</p> <p>Katie motioned to require a bibliography for citations. The motion was seconded by Julie.</p>	<p>Motion to require a bibliography : Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	<p>Staff will revise Tier 2 and 3 score sheets.</p>
<p>Public Comment</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Next Meeting/Final Comments	The next meeting will be held on May 20, 2015.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:00 pm.	None	None