



Wednesday, April 17, 2013 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:30 a.m.

3600 Westwind Blvd.

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

Alfredo Perez, First 5 Sonoma County

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council

Dan Blake, SCOE

Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way of the Wine Country

Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department

Katie Greaves, Human Services Department

Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office

Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department (staff)

Marla Stuart, Human Services Department (project manager)

Megan Sirna, Human Services Department (staff)

Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office

Rob Halverson, Probation Department

Robert Judd, Community Foundation

Serena Lineau, City of Santa Rosa

Steven Jackson, SCOE

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes	Introductions. Motion to approve the minutes	Motion: Serena Second: BJ Yes:10 No:0 Abstain: 1 (Dan)	None
Updates & Reports	Update report with Portfolio activities since March meeting. Short update about some new positions in Upstream. Katie arrived. Update on new positions in Upstream Is there an issue with discussing applications when only one of the reviewers is present? <u>Comments</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> When one reviewer says something is missing, give us something to target the discussion. Need to get to where to look in a very large application. It is important to be able to talk it out with the other reviewer. It is difficult for consistency. Since we meet once a month, it may be worth holding the discussion to the next meeting. <u>We won't make a decision, but here are some options</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It can be difficult 	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It works fine. • Get more information from the person. • Assign the review to another person. • If the reviewers know they are not able to be there, they decide if their review should be discussed. • Ask the applicant what they would prefer • Send any additional ideas to Larissa. 		
Applications	<p><u>Double Punches Boxing</u> Serena recused herself. Her organization is a funder of this program. Larissa read program description. Carol--Questions, literature review, methods and analysis are missing. BJ-- it is a light evaluation but it had most of the things. I saw questions, minimal analysis, raw data is there. Would like to see a more robust evaluation in the future. The methodology is not the best in the world. It is a lot of self- report which I don't put a lot of stock in. Manual was excellent. Carol—If our standard is most, then I think it is fine. Katie—if I am going to be reviewing an evaluation, I want to make sure that the analysis is rigorous enough. I think we need to talk about whether or not there is an impact on families based on the rigor of the evaluation. Carol--We had the same evaluation last time and it was not approved. Marla--We do need to discuss those issues but it is totally possible that we might approve the Measure O evaluation with some application and not others. BJ--The outcomes are really high. Even if this is self-report, that is still very positive. Even though it is perception, there is something positive happening there. Motion to approve Double Punches for tier 2.</p> <p><u>Street Outreach</u> Serena recused herself. Her organization is a funder of this program. Monique recused herself. Her organization is a funder of this program. Larissa read program description. Katie--The measures in the SR Choice Evaluation did not match to the stated objectives in the OJJDP evaluation and the literature review and the logic model. Arrests were not addressed in CHOICE. That leaves only the OJJDP evaluation. Does it match the local implementation? There were 5 cites and 3 of them did not implement the program. The ones that were implemented had problems around target population. There were too many questions to approve it. Is it sufficient to say that the local implementation is promising?</p>	<p>Motion: BJ Second: Leo Yes: 11 No: 0</p> <p>Motion: Rob Second: Robert Yes: 10 No: 0</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Marla-Susan was the other reviewer. She is not here and we were not able to speak to her about this application.</p> <p>It seems that they do not need to evaluate all outcomes.</p> <p>This is evaluation light is still in my mind.</p> <p>Why should we do this now if it is not going to be right?</p> <p>I need someone who has read the materials to have this discussion with me—an informed discussion. Susan might be able to assuage my issues.</p> <p>Motion to postpone a decision until next month.</p> <p><u>Family Therapy</u></p> <p>Rob recused himself. His organization is a funder of this program.</p> <p>Serena recused herself. Her organization is a funder of this program.</p> <p>Larissa read program description.</p> <p>Rob left.</p> <p>Julie-Is this Tier 1 or Tier 2? They are not yet licensed for FFT. Everything they submitted was related to FFT. They did not go through the process to get the licenses, etc. to use this program.</p> <p>Dan-I did not make that distinction. Can we approve their application given where they are in the process? I thought so.</p> <p>Marla--They are not eligible for Tier 1 because they have not done the required licensure process.</p> <p>Julie--They say that FFT is informing their practice. Everything has FFT.</p> <p>Katie--The copyright issue is not our issue.</p> <p>Motion to approve for Tier 2</p>	<p>Motion: Carol</p> <p>Second: BJ</p> <p>Yes: 9</p> <p>No: 1</p>	
<p>Discussion Items</p>	<p><u>Accreditation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should they tell us what the accrediting body requires? • External monitoring of program delivery • They passed. • It is recurring, frequency of the time frame • What were the requirements for accreditation? • The overarching purpose is that they are convincing us they have fidelity to the model. <p><u>Review Committee role in evaluating the quality of evaluation and evaluation plan</u></p> <p>Read the Tier 2 criteria for the evaluation.</p> <p>What are we going to require about rigor for Tier 2 evaluation?</p> <p>Leo: clear expected outcomes are something that exist in the logic model and literature review</p> <p>Katie: should be able to see the same outcomes in evaluation as logic model, lit review, and program design. Should be able to see the link in the logic model</p>		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>What if there are outcomes that they don't have an evaluation on? That comes up often. The Santa Rosa Choice evaluation was used for several different orgs and so the evaluation does not necessarily We want to be able to raise the rigor. Is self report good enough? Katie: it depends on what they are proposing to do. If it is around 40 assets, yes. If it is about behavior change, then they should have something else. Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were you happy? (not alone) • What learning happened? (Quiz, test, observation, pre/post test) • What behavior changes have occurred? (Self-report, observation) • What are the results? –long term • ROI? <p>What level do we want? Do we require triangulation? No. They need to match. Are they measuring what they say they are achieving? Applicants needs to have an opportunity to weave these things together. Level best.</p>		
Public Comment	Maria Lopez, Gustavo Martinez and Ron Soto made public comment.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourn at 3:30pm.	None	None