



Wednesday, May 16, 2011 - Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 – 3:30 p.m.

Westwind Blvd – Orville Wright Conf Room

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council

Christina Rivera, County Administrator’s Office

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

Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department

Monique Chapman, Sheriff’ Office

Marla Stuart, Human Services Department (Project Manager)

Robert Judd, Community Foundation

Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa

Stephen Jackson, Sonoma County Office of Education

Members of the Public (listed alphabetically)

Gail Wright, Sonoma County Office of Education

Lisa Rohe, TLC Child and Family Services

Teri McClanahan, Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Agenda, Minutes	<p>Marla welcomed the group and mentioned that meetings will start when 8 members (a quorum) are present.</p> <p>Introductions.</p> <p>Discussion about whether or not minutes from April 18 accurately portrayed the discussion about the Conflict of Interest section in the Portfolio Review Committee Bylaws. There was additional discussion of the appropriate Conflict of Interest policy for the Committee</p> <p>Motion to approve April 18, 2012 minutes with the following deletions from the Approve Bylaws section:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reviewers will not review applications for programs their agency funds. VI A 5: Add “funder / granter” <p>Group decided to bring back the Bylaws and County Board of Supervisors Rules of Procedures for discussion at the next meeting.</p>	<p>Motion: Jennifer O’Donnell</p> <p>Second: B.J. Bischoff</p> <p>Ayes: 9 Nos: 0 Abstain: 0</p> <p>Absent: 2 (Stephen Jackson, Carol Simmons)</p>	<p>Add this item to the June 20, 2012 agenda and bring copies</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Reports	<p>Stephen Jackson arrived.</p> <p>Report on Portfolio submission activity. It is the intention of staff to provide regular updates to the Committee in this format. Larissa made a correction to line #3 of 'New Submissions.' Status should read 'Technical assistance.'</p> <p>Group discussed the report and suggested changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Show information by supervisory district • Show more clearly which programs active and which are complete 		<p>Make changes and update report.</p>
Applications to the Portfolio	<p>1. AVID: Sonoma County Office of Education</p> <p>Dan and Stephen recused themselves. They work for the submitting agency.</p> <p>Marla reviewed the submission and scoring sheets due to the fact that neither reviewer is any longer on the committee.</p> <p>When either of the reviewers are not present or are no longer on the committee, a vote will be taken.</p> <p>One reviewer had recommended Tier 2 and the other had not due to the lack of evidence of a manual. The manual requirements in July 11, 2011 version of the Application Instructions were reviewed and compared to the manual in the submission.</p> <p>Members voiced concerns that the manual submitted would not allow you to replicate the program. They also felt it was likely that there was an existing manual for this program. They suggested program staff provide technical assistance to the applicant.</p> <p>Public comment: Gail Wright, Sonoma County Office of Education</p> <p>Motion to deny tier placement due to lack of acceptable manual.</p> <p>Carol Simmons arrived.</p> <p>2. Motivational Interviewing: Petaluma People Services Center</p> <p>Katie said that though participant responsiveness was not clear, she felt that all other elements of fidelity were present so she recommended Tier 1.</p> <p>Carol said denied tier placement because she was concerned about training of program staff. It was not clear if all staff that uses Motivational Interviewing were formally trained in it.</p> <p>The fidelity requirements were reviewed.</p> <p>Reviewers decided that additional information about staff training should be requested and sent to Carol for approval. As long as all staff who is implementing the program receives some manor manner of formal training, they will be approved.</p>	<p>Motion: Katie Greves Second: Christina Rivera Ayes: 8 Nos: 0 Abstain: 2 (Dan Blake, Stephen Jackson) Absent: 1 (Carol Simmons)</p>	<p>Provide technical assistance to Sonoma County Office of Education</p> <p>Provide technical assistance to Petaluma People Services Center</p>

	<p>3. Center for Economic Success: Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County Before beginning the review, there was a brief discussion of conflicts of interest and Robert, Serena and Julie recused themselves due to funding and professional ties with the agency. When either of the reviewers are not present or are no longer on the committee, a vote will be taken. Marla reviewed the submission and scoring sheets due to the fact that Lynn Walton is no longer on the committee. Lynn had denied tier placement on the grounds that there was no evaluation plan. Carol approved the submission for Tier 3. The evaluation plan requirements in July 11, 2011 version of the Application Instructions were reviewed and compared to the submission. Carol and other members said that the evaluation plan did not meet the criteria. Public comment: Teri McClanahan, Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County Jennifer recused herself due to funding ties pointed out by Terri. Motion to deny tier placement due to lack of acceptable evolution-evaluation plan.</p> <p>Break 2:15-2:20. Katie Greves left the meeting.</p> <p>4. THP Plus: TLC Child and Family Services Marla reviewed the submission and scoring sheets due to the fact that Leo Tacata was not at the meeting. Leo had denied tier placement on the grounds that all elements of the logic model were not present. Overall, he thought the submission was robust. B.J. had approved tier placement. She commented that the missing pieces of the logic model were present in other parts of the submission. Group discussed whether or not all elements must be on the logic model or if it is acceptable for them to appear in other areas of the document. Public comment: Lisa Rohe, TLC Child and Family Services Motion to approve THC Plus for Tier 2.</p>	<p>Motion: Carol Simmons Second: Stephen Jackson Ayes: 7 Nos: 0 Abstain: 4 (Robert Judd, Jennifer O'Donnell, Serena Lienau, Julie Sabbag-Maskey) Absent: 0</p> <p>Motion: B.J. Bischoff Second: Christina Rivera Ayes: 8 Nos: 1 (Julie Sabbag-Maskey) Abstain: 1 (Robert Judd) Absent: 1 (Katie Greves)</p>	<p>Provide technical assistance to Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County</p> <p>Notify THP Plus of Tier placement</p>
Approvals	<p>Report on schedule preferences of committee members. First choice based on email survey was to continue with third Wednesdays of the month from 1:00-3:30 p.m. Motion to approve schedule for remainder of 2010: Third Wednesday from 1:00-3:30 p.m.</p>	<p>Motion: Stephen Jackson Second: Robert Judd Ayes: 10 Nos: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 1 (Katie Greves)</p>	
Discussion Items	<p>1. Review of evaluation process and proposal for addressing process questions Marla gave the following notes on the review process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thank you for turning your reviews in on time. • Please write no tier when you deny a program. If they need to apply for a different tier, we will work that out with them in technical assistance. • Process questions are good but we are going to propose a new way of dealing with them that is separate from the scoring sheet. A separate form will be filled out and returned to Larissa for process questions which should be address by the whole 	<p>None</p>	<p>Create a new form and begin sending with reviews. Change form to have a yes/no box for recommendation</p>

	<p>committee. Larissa will hold these until the review is closed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you have concerns which prevent you from completing your review, you may discuss these with Larissa or Marla. <p>2. Board of Supervisors Conflict of interest Policy</p> <p>Policy says that members who recuse themselves will leave the room. After some discussion it was decided this item should be added to the agenda for next time.</p> <p>There was additional discussion about the logic model and whether or not all elements must be on the logic model sheet. Suggestions included posting score sheets on the website or providing logic model template and asking that everyone fill it out.</p> <p>An announcement was made about upcoming Portfolio workshops.</p>		Add to agenda for June 20, 2012
Public comment	No additional comments.	None	
Adjourn	<p>Motion to adjourn</p> <p>Meeting adjourned at 3:09 p.m.</p>	<p>Motion: Carol Simmons</p> <p>Second: Robert Judd</p> <p>Ayes: 10 Nos: 0 Abstain: 0</p> <p>Absent: 1 (Katie Greves)</p>	

Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Dates

*Third Wednesday of Every Month from 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
3600 Westwind Blvd – Orville Wright Room*

2012	2013
April 18	January 16
May 16	February 20
June 20	March 20
July 18	April 17
August 15	May 15
September 19	June 19
October 17	July 17
November 21	August 21
December 19	September 18
December 19	October 16
	November 20
	December 18