



Wednesday, January 16, 2013 - Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 – 3:30 p.m.

1202 Apollo Way – Annadel Conf Room

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
 Christina Rivera, County Administrator’s Office
 Dr. B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting
 Elizabeth Chicoine, Department of Health Services
 Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way of the Wine Country
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department

Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department (staff)
 Leo Tacata, District Attorney’s Office
 Megan Sirna, Human Services Department (staff)
 Robert Judd, Community Foundation
 Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa
 Stephen Jackson, Sonoma County Office of Education
 Susan Castillo, Department of Health Services

Members of the Public (listed alphabetically)

None

| Topic | Discussion | Decision | Next Steps |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Welcome, Introductions, Agenda, Minutes | <p>Larissa welcomed the group. Marla is on vacation. Overview of agenda.</p> <p>Motion to approve December 19, 2012 minutes</p> <p>Some members’ terms are ending in March. An email will be sent out to those whose terms are ending to ask if they plan to continue to sit on the committee. We hope you all can continue to participate.</p> | <p>Motion: Jennifer Second: Robert Ayes: 6 Nos: 0 Abstain: 3 Absent: 5</p> | |

| Topic | Discussion | Decision | Next Steps |
|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------|
| Reports | <p>Report on Portfolio submission activity. It is the intention of staff to provide regular updates to the Committee in this format.</p> <p>Group discussed the report, as well as mentioned organizations that are in the process of applying to the portfolio.</p> <p>Susan and Elisabeth arrived.</p> <p>Larissa asked the group if anyone wanted to make comments on approved applications they reviewed, but the reviewer's from the approved application were absent.</p> | None | None |
| Approvals | <p>New procedure for discussing applications in committee meetings. According to the October meeting minutes, there was consensus to try two things</p> <p>1) when applications will be discussed at the Portfolio Review Committee meeting, the point of discussion on the application will be made public prior to the meeting and,</p> <p>2) these applications will always go to a vote.</p> <p>It is hoped that this will allow reviewers to better prepare for application discussions and that it will allow them to state their position more openly.</p> <p>Stephen arrived.</p> | <p>Motion: Katie Second: Julie Ayes: 11 Nos: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 3</p> | None |
| Applications to the Portfolio | <p>Trauma-focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy from the Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship – the criteria to discuss is evidence of accreditation. Susan and Elisabeth were reviewers.</p> <p>Susan did not approve the application based on the evidence of accreditation. The person who is accredited to do CBT-TF needs to have ongoing training, whether they find it themselves or go to a group that has that focus. They provided a certificate of training. That is not accreditation. “I couldn’t find out from OJJDP but couldn’t answer, so I went on certification website, and they said after the training, they need to have ongoing training as well. And I wanted to see how they do that.”</p> <p>Elisabeth said she would be supportive of going back for more information on accreditation.</p> <p>The applicant submitted a certificate of training in the program. There were questions about whether or not they intended this to be evidence of accreditation and if this evidence was sufficient or not.</p> <p>Members left this highlights an ongoing issue with many applications. The applicant needs to show what is required for accreditation and how they meet that. Reviewers should not be</p> | See next page | None |

| | | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| | <p>searching for the information on their own since requirements for fidelity differ across programs. If the clearinghouse says all they need is training, then that's all we require but in this case, it was not clear from the clearinghouse what was required for fidelity. If it is not in the application, and it is making the reviewer do extra levels of search we need to go back to the applicant and say we need more information.</p> <p>Motion to deny tier placement.</p> <p>Proposed changes to Tier 1 form based on discussion. Changes to Tier 1 will be revisited and approved next time.</p> | <p>Motion: Jennifer Second: Christina Ayes: 12 Nos: 0 Abstain: 0 Absent: 2</p> | <p>Discuss changes to Tier 1 form</p> |
| <p>Criteria Revisions</p> | <p>Based on the training from December, we found some issues with the forms and updated them. Larissa walked through the changes.</p> <p>Tier 2 – Instead of asking to them to address how lit review is connected to program design and evaluation is connected to program design; we are now adding a question to the end to describe how the lit review, logic model, etc informed the program design. Also asking if there are adaptations to the manual (intent of question is for them to be implementing the manual exactly as submitted) Members expressed a desire for applicants to still discuss the positive outcomes of their evaluation.</p> <p>Tier 3 – Similar to Tier 2 changes mentioned above. Changes are approved by consensus.</p> <p>Stephen asked if we have discussed how the forms are working for applicants. Staff plans to host a CBO meeting where the Portfolio application process will be discussed.</p> | <p>None</p> | <p>None</p> |
| <p>Discussion Items</p> | <p>No discussion items.</p> | <p>None</p> | <p>None</p> |
| <p>Public comment</p> | <p>No additional comments.</p> | <p>None</p> | <p>None</p> |
| <p>Adjourn</p> | <p>Meeting adjourned at 2:43 p.m.</p> | <p>None</p> | <p>None</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

2013 Meetings

February 20

March 20

April 17

May 15

June 19

July 17

August 21

September 18

October 16

November 20

December 18