UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS
It is easier to build strong children than to fix broken lives.

Wednesday, August 21, 2013 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes
1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
1202 Apollo Way, Santa Rosa, Shiloh Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council

Dan Blake, SCOE

Katie Greaves, Human Services Department

Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office

Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office

Robert Judd, Community Foundation

Stephen Jackson, SCOE

Staff (listed alphabetically)

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting

Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Oscar Chavez, Human Services Department

Public (listed alphabetically)

Michael Wright

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Alfredo Perez, First 5 Sonoma County

Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way

Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department

Rob Halverson, Probation Department

Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa

Susan Castillo, Department of Health Services

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes	Introductions. Oscar welcomed everyone. B.J. has temporarily resigned her Review Committee Membership. She has contracted with the Human Services Department to run the Portfolio until a program development manager is hired. At that point she will resume membership on the Review Committee. While we wait for Dan and Stephen let's review updates to the Portfolio and the Clearinghouse Renewal Process summary. There are no new programs to review this month. YWCA, MAYi, Russian River Counselors and the Goodwill are all receiving technical assistance. We anticipate submissions from 3 – 4 agencies in the next 1 – 2 months. B.J. continues to work on the manual. Today's discussion on fidelity will inform a white paper that will be included in the manual. We also need to have a discussion on Tier 2 requirements. This will be added to the September agenda. Over the last month we researched Clearinghouse processes for program renewal. The American Diabetes Association Education Recognition Program has the most rigorous standards. The ADA requires programs reapply every 4 years or be removed from the Clearinghouse. They also		Upstream staff will include a discussion of Tier 2 requirements on the September agenda.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	audit 5% of all approved programs. Renewal applications should be submitted a minimum of 30 days before the program's expiration date. The remaining Clearinghouses take it upon themselves to monitor current research and periodically revisit interventions. Based on the research a program may be elevated, removed or allowed to remain in the same standing. We reviewed this information to inform our decisions around the renewal process. Dan and Stephen arrived. **Motion** to approve the minutes, with corrections.	Motion: Robert Second: Carlos Yes: 8 No: 0 Abstain: 0	
Action Items	**Logic Model** The Logic Model an action item because it guides our work. The version you have today reflects the edits you suggested over the last month. **Discussion**: Problem Statement: • For the sake of clarity you should add Problem 1/Solution 1and Problem 2/ Solution 2 to the Problem Statement. • You should add *costly* to "confusing and complex" in Problem Statement 2. • The purpose of a Logic Model is to prevent drift from our goals. Environmental Factors: • The words "resistant" and "unwilling" are used in Environmental Factors. Could we replace these with reasons why organizations would be resistant and the Board would be unwilling? • It's not that the Board is unwilling but that they need justification. Does the evidence for support exist? • Political winds may shift regardless of the evidence. • We could say: "Political and other factors can impact the Board's willingness to support decision…" • Service providers might be resistant for a variety of reasons. We need to give a basis for their resistance. • Let's use more neutral language: "Challenges may include the following: Service providers' incorporation of evidence into their practice; Funders' use of the Portfolio as a funding criteria; The Board of Supervisors' support of decisions made by the Review		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	Committee and/or the Appeal Committee." Inputs and Outputs: • There is an unstated assumption that we have a collective commitment to Technical Assistance. We believe providing Technical Assistance will improve organizational capacity. • Technical Assistance should be an Output. • Change the second Input bullet to read: "Commitment by funders to use evidence informed practice and the Portfolio as the basis for one of their funding criteria." • Is there a place to include our sectors, e.g., health, justice, community, etc.? • If we go back to our purpose it would be inappropriate to list our sectors. This should be left in the by-laws. • Let's change Input bullet number three to read: "Private and organizational volunteers *representative of Sonoma County…*" Short Term Outcomes: • Is it redundant to say "promote replication and expand referrals"? • Promoting replication is more philosophical. It shows scalability. • Should referrals be listed under "Funders"? • Referrals should move to "Service Providers". • Funders need to stop applying band aids and start looking at how to prevent costs. • We need to say that we will consistently add active Portfolio members. If we're doing it right we should see an increase in the Portfolio. • Should there be an input or output related to training Technical Assistants and education for us on the Review Committee? • An input is that we have these dialogues and are educated through them. • Should there be an input or output that we are trained and engaging in ongoing professional learning activities? • Yes, that would be an output. Intermediate and Long Term: • Higher Education should actually be two separate outcomes: Higher education *access* and Higher education *completion*. • We need to revise the language of the indicators. There should be arrows before each indicator to specify an increase or decrease. • It would be easier to break the indicators into Increase and Decrease categories than to use arrows. • We also need to include the long-term outcome that we expect to see investments		

Upstream Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes for 8/21/13, Sonoma County Human Services Department (565-5800)
Author Joni Thacher

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	increase in some departments and decrease in others. For example we expect to see greater investments in upstream programs and fewer investments in probation. • I don't know if it's up to us to include this long term outcome. We should only reflect the 22 indictors given to us by the Policy Committee. • It reflects what the Portfolio should look like. We could add to Intermediate Outcomes that we should see greater community investment in education and prevention. • In both Intermediate and Long Term Outcomes we need a systemic outcome. • Should we add the Long Term Outcome that Sonoma County will become the healthiest county by 2020? • Is our goal to enlarge institutions because they have answers that can help or to redirect and empower people? • An Intermediate Outcome is to increase investments in Upstream and evidence based practice. • A Long Term Outcome is that Sonoma County will invest in Upstream. • Who is this Logic Model for? Us. It's valuable in its ability to prevent drift. We ask other organizations to do this, we need to do it ourselves. • There is messiness to politics. If we are committed to telling a story through data it will make a difference and dispel myths. • We are not a static body, this Logic Model will prove useful for new committee members. • Service providers will look at this to see where they fit in. It needs to be clear if it is going to be used beyond this group. • There are too many changes to the Logic Model to approve it today. The Upstream Staff will make the edits we discussed and resubmit it for committee approval in September. **Renewal Process** B.J. summarized the proposed Tier 1renewal process and noted that 4 programs will expire from the Portfolio before the end of 2013. **Discussion**: Tier 1: • To clarify, the suggestion is that all tiers will submit an application using current forms? The only difference is that this time around they will check the renewal box at the top of the application. • I think contacting them at 24 months is too early. Let's not remind Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs until 18 months. • If a program is dropped from a clearinghouse during their three years on the Portfolio		Upstream Staff will edit the Logic Model and submit for review in September. The status of

Upstream Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes for 8/21/13, Sonoma County Human Services Department (565-5800)
Author Joni Thacher

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	can they finish out their 3 years or will they be immediately removed? This is a separate discussion we are only talking about the renewal process right now. • What will happen to organizations that don't reapply? Will we still list them publically somewhere? • Can we publically record all the programs ever listed? • We are creating a searchable database that will allow people to search for programs by funder, type of program, target audience, etc. We need to include past programs in this search. • We will always use current Clearinghouse information. The Clearinghouses will do the leg work for us. Organizations just have to show us that there program is still listed on the Clearinghouse. • If their program has changed they will need to show fidelity. • We need to continue to encourage development. Can an organization just submit to a Clearinghouse or do they need to show what they've done to progress, what they've done to move along their evidence based continuum? • We don't say anything about demonstrating forward progress in our current instructions so we shouldn't require reflection for renewal. It's not a requirement for new applicants so it shouldn't be a requirement for renewals. • There is value in asking them to self reflect. Isn't asking them to list changes and adaptation the same as asking for self reflection? • We need to revise the language in Tier 1, point 3: … "update to reflect changes in the program's fidelity and adaptations." • Why don't we add a line on the Tier 1 application form under fidelity that asks renewals to tell us about adaptations they may have made? • If we do that we should give specific example of adaptations they may have made. • On their renewal application the Clearinghouse will do the work for us. We don't need to see adaptations. • Yes, but don't we want them to address the issues and surprises they may have run into? What if we took a different perspective? Why don't we hold a convening with people who have renewed and ask them to reflect on their experience running a Tier 1 program? • How would asking these questions reflect our mission and how would we respond? What weight would we give their answers? Could a program be denied Tier 1 status based on their reflections? • When you're implementing an evidence based program the challenges are practical.		programs removed from a Clearinghouse will be added to a later agenda. Joni will add history to our list of searchable criteria.

Upstream Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes for 8/21/13, Sonoma County Human Services Department (565-5800)
Author Joni Thacher

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	Where will we get funding? How will we handle new employees that aren't trained? There is a learning curve and compliance can be costly.		
	• We need to create a learning community, not make reflection part of the renewal process.		
	• The onus is on us to give them feedback. It shouldn't only be about passing.		
	• It's valuable for an organization to remain current. These steps can become time consuming. Are we competent to speak to these groups? Maybe reflection happens while they're receiving Technical Assistance?		
	• Reflection could be a function of the Research Institute. This is the responsibility of the staff not the Review Committee. Not including mandatory reflection as a part of the renewal process doesn't suggest we have no interest in pushing them to improve, but it's not our responsibility. We can encourage growth without making it a criterion.		
	• We need to go back to our Logic Model. It does not suggest that we should give this level of Technical Assistance.		
	Tier 2:		
	B.J. summarized renewal document.		
	• Renewals will submit a new application. If their literature review is expired they will need to submit a new one.		
	• Do evaluations expire? This is a conversation for another day.		Upstream staff will add this discussion to a future agenda.
	• We should make sure that at their 18, 12, and 6 month reminders we remind them that their literature review needs to be current.		
	Tier 3		
	B.J. summarized renewal document.		
	• Do we allow a grace period for Tier 3 programs?		
	• I appreciate the language used in the renewal document. If an organization has implemented their Tier 3 evaluation plan they should be well staged to become a Tier 2 program.		
	• Yes, but we still have to evaluate their evaluation.		
	Motion to approve the Renewal Process.	Motion: Stephen Second: Carlos	
	Further discussion:		
	• Have we decided that there is no advantage to asking "What changes have you made in the last three years?"		
	• What would the benefit be and could poor articulation expose them to tier denial? What weight would we give the question?		
	• I don't think we're ready to get that kind of information and use it effectively. It's not in		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	our mission to develop evidence based thinking in our community. Until we have rationale for capturing this reflection information we need to evaluate them as a new application. **Renewals due in the next three months:** • What do we do with the four programs that will be up for renewal in the next four months? • The Tier 1's will be easy. We've talked with the Tier 3 and we think they're ready to move forward. They have an evaluation in place. • We need to give them a 6 -12 month grace period. • B.J. should call everyone and see if they have an evaluation in place. • We should give everyone due for renewal between now and August 2014 a 12 month grace period. Either they all get an additional 12 months on the Portfolio or we give them all until 12 months after the day we notify them to renew. • We want to delegate this decision to the Upstream staff. **Motion to authorize the Upstream staff to establish a grace period and revised expiration dates for programs expiring in the next 12 months.** **Time limit change** We would like to allow reviewers 5 days instead of three days to return their reviews. **Motion to allow reviewers 5 days to return applications.**	Yes: 8 No: 0 Abstain: 0 Motion: Carol Second: Katie Yes: 8 No: 0 Abstain: 0 Motion: Carol Second: Dan Yes: 8 No: 0 Abstain: 0	 Upstream staff will develop a renewal system for programs expiring in the next 12 months. Upstream staff will reflect this change in the Manual and By-laws.
Public Comment	B.J. opened the meeting up for public comment. Michael thanked the committee for their work and allowing him to listen to their process.	None	None
New Forms	We have revised the application and scoring forms, and would like your feedback. To allow for flexibility in the future this is not an Action Item. The staff needs to be able to make punctuation and grammatical corrections without committee approval. We would like to post the new forms on the website as soon as possible. We will take into consideration all of the change you suggest today and for the next three days. **Discussion**: • There is a formatting error on the Tier 1 application.	None	Upstream staff will make all recommended changes. Katie will review language used on scores sheets and

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	• Let's add the instructions on fidelity in the *Instructions* document to the chart. • Page numbers in the Instructions need to be corrected. • Could Katie review the language on the score sheets and give us feedback? • Katie would like a form to request an item be added to next month's agenda.		provide feedback. Joni will email Katie the agenda item request form.
Next Meeting	The next meeting will be on September 18 at 520 Mendocino Ave.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:32 pm.	None	None