Wednesday, October 16, 2013 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes
1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.
520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

Members (listed alphabetically)
Alfredo Perez, First 5 Sonoma County
Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
Dan Blake, SCOE
Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way
Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office
Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office
Robert Judd, Community Foundation
Rob Halverson, Probation Department
Stephen Jackson, SCOE

Staff (listed alphabetically)
B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting
Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)
Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
Oscar Chavez, Human Services Department
Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa
Susan Castillo, Department of Health Services

Public (listed alphabetically)
Angie Dillon-Shore

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, Updates	Introductions. B.J. welcomed everyone and introduced Angie Dillon-Shore who will be joining the Human Services Department as a Program Development Manager. The committee reviewed the minutes from the last meeting. Dan motioned to approve the minutes. Discussion: • There is a misspelling on pg 4. B.J. reviewed the Update Report, Fidelity Chart and Logic Model. California State Preschool Program should be listed on the Update Report and website as *California State Preschool Program with Perry Preschool adaptations*.	Motion to approve the minutes: Dan Second: Monique Yes: 11 No: 0 Abstain: 0	Staff will correct the minutes. Staff will update the name of California State Preschool Program on the website.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Removal of Portfolio Review Committee Member	Susan Castillo has been absent from Portfolio Review Committee Meetings since January. Her last review was in April. The by-laws state that a member can be removed if they miss more than two meetings without contacting staff. The Upstream staff has contacted Susan on more than 5 occasions to ask for her resignation. She has not responded. We will entertain a motion to regretfully remove her from the Portfolio Review Committee. **Summary: Susan Castillo was regretfully removed from the Portfolio Review Committee.**	Carol motioned that we regretfully remove Susan Castillo from the Portfolio Review Committee. Second: Jennifer Yes: 11 No: 0 Abstain: 0	Staff will appoint a member from the Health Services Department to replace Susan.
Draft Renewal Documents	B.J. summarized the revised Renewal Policy. Discussion: Renewal Process: • It would be helpful on the Renewal Policy to bold or italicize "same tier" and "different tier." Program Description: • The committee discussed the value of asking organizations to report how being on the Portfolio impacted them. • This information should be included in the renewal process, but should be for staff and Policy Committee use only. The reviewers do not need this information. We will ask organizations that choose not to renew to answer the same question. • It is necessary to include questions 1 – 7 on the Program Description page. Some of these answers may have changed over time. • Do we need to ask who the implementers are? Yes, it's important to know both who is applying the program to the Portfolio and where the program is being implemented. **Summary: We will include a question about impact on the Program Description form, but reviewers will not see it. It will be for staff use only.** Tier 1 Renewal Form: • The only difference from the original application is that we are asking organizations to report Outcomes in Sonoma County that reflect their logic model. • There would need to be specific criteria for us to score this question.. What weight would it carry? • Are we asking them to do something that was not originally stated when they applied? • How do we know if they are evaluating their program? Some are, some are not. • Is a local evaluation for Tier 1 programs necessary? Could they just show outcomes		Staff will bold or italicize "same tier" and "different tier" in the Renewal Policy. Staff will remove the question about outcomes from the Tier 1 form.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	related to their logic model without having an evaluation? • If we're trying to move the needle in Sonoma County we need to know what impact the program is having locally. • Tier 1 programs cost more because organizations are paying for a rigorous evaluation that has already been done. • Fidelity is the most important criterion for Tier 1 programs. **Summary: Remove the outcomes section from the Tier 1 Renewal Form. It's enough for them to show fidelity to the model.** Tier 2 Renewal Form • We are asking if there is a new evaluation in place. • What weight will this carry? • The wording is confusing. Let's remove the second option on question number 4, "We have conducted an evaluation on the Sonoma County implementation of this program over the past three years and it is attached." • We don't need to ask if they have new cohorts with their new evaluation. They've already shown us that they had more than one cohort in their original application. **Summary: Remove the second option under Evaluation question 4. Remove the Cohorts question, We will ask for a local evaluation, but it will not affect their renewal approval.** Tier 3 Renewal Form • What compromises a viable reason to renew a Tier 3 program instead of applying as a Tier 2 program? • Are lack of man power and money good reasons? • Lack of money and manpower may be viable reasons now, but as the Human Services Department is able to offer more support to Tier 3 organizations we should see less of this. • At 6 months we should encourage them to contact the Human Services Department immediately about their evaluation plan if they have concerns. **Summary: The Tier 3 Renewal Form is acceptable as is. Staff should consistently encourage them to reach out to the Human Services Department for help with their evaluation plan.**	Stephen motioned to accept the renewal forms with changes. Second: Robert Yes: 11 No: 0 Abstain: 0	Staff will remove the Outcomes section from Tier 1 applications. Staff will remove the second option under question 4 and the question regarding cohorts from the Tier 2 renewal form. Staff will develop language for Tier 3 renewal reminder emails that encourages Tier 3 programs to request technical assistance.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Common Language for Feedback	As we talk with organization about the renewal process it would be helpful to have a common language. Discussion: • It's important for us to see changes. No program is static. • One of our goals is to move the community and build capacity in Sonoma County. • Upstream is a progression. The renewal process helps carry programs from one level to the next. This is especially true for Tier 3 programs. • Social issues and social science are continually evolving. • We are continually learning. Issues are complicated and moving. It requires due diligence on our part. The renewal process is part of this due diligence. **Summary: The renewal process is necessary to monitor and understand a community that is consistently changing and evolving.**	None	Staff will include this language in the manual.
Tier 3 and Tier 2 Evaluations	Our current structure suggests that a Tier 3 Evaluation Plan will result in an acceptable Tier 2 Evaluation. We may need to add qualitative qualifiers to the Tier 3 application to make this a reality. • This should be a practical process not an academic effort. Applications and Evaluation Plans should result in practical and useful action for organizations. • Some Evaluation Plans have questionable strategies that do not directly relate to outcomes. We need to ensure they have valid measures of expected outcomes. • Tier 3 applications only require that organizations have all the necessary elements. We need to be judging if all of their elements relate to each other. Does the Logic Model reflect their Literature Review? Does their Evaluation Plan reflect their Logic Model? • Could we have a study session on how to read an evaluation? I don't think we all have the necessary background to do this effectively. • We need to add additional language to Tier 3 and Tier 2 applications that encourages organizations to create an Evaluation or Evaluation Plan that incorporates their Literature Review and Logic Model. It should also align Tier 3 organizations with Tier 2 requirements so they are prepared. **Summary: We need to adjust the language on the applications to encourage organizations to link all the elements in their application. We also need a training session on evaluating evaluations.**	None	Staff will create language to add to Tier 1 and 2 applications to explain that all elements of their application need to clearly link together. New language will be emailed to Committee members for feedback and approval Staff will arrange for a training session on evaluating evaluations at a future meeting.
Local Evaluation for Tier 2 programs	Is there a time limit for evaluations? • Should there be a time limit on the age of an evaluation? We need to know what the best practices are around this. • Culture, society and demographics change. Evaluations need to be current.	None	

Upstream Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes for 10/16/13, Sonoma County Human Services Department (565-5800)
Author Joni Thacher

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	• Some of our programs would fall off because their evaluations are not from the last 3 – 7 years. • We could build in fidelity to Tier 2 programs. • The issue is societal change, not fidelity. • What if a Tier 1 program has an old evaluation? Tier 1 evaluations are robust enough that time shouldn't matter. Again, the issue isn't how robust the evaluation was, it's does the evaluation reflect changes in society? • We need to look at the Literature Review. If it is acceptable and the evaluation reflects the literature, then the evaluation should be fine. • The Literature Review needs to be its own criteria when we score the logic model. **Summary: There does not need to be a time limit for evaluations. However, we need to build a connection between the literature review and the logic model into the score sheet.** Do Tier 2 programs need to have a local evaluation now or in the future? • This speaks to a broader picture of the evolution of Upstream. How important is it for us to know if a program is effective in Sonoma County? • Without local information we risk bringing in programs that don't work. • Could the Policy Committee decide this? Do they have the background to make this decision? • Our goal is to establish where a program stands on the evidence continuum. • Historically, there was a local evaluation requirement for Tier 2 renewals. At some point it was dropped. • Could the Shared Outcomes group include this issue in their 3 year work plan?		Staff will add literature review as a criteria for the Logic Model on all Tier 2 and 3 score sheets. Staff will bring the question of local evaluations for Tier 2 programs to the Shared Outcomes Workgroup.
Public Comment	None	None	None
Next Meeting	The next meeting will be on November 20 at 520 Mendocino Ave.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:30 pm.	None	None