



Wednesday, July 17, 2013 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

3600 Westwind Blvd., Orville Wright room

Members (listed alphabetically)

- Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
- B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting
- Dan Blake, SCOE
- Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office
- Stephen Jackson, SCOE
- Robert Judd, Community Foundation
- Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa
- Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way
- Alfredo Perez, First 5 Sonoma County
- Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
- Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
- Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office

Staff (listed alphabetically)

- Oscar Chavez, Human Services Department
- Caryn Henkel, Human Services Department
- Marla Stuart, Human Services Department
- Megan Sirna, Human Services Department
- Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Guests (listed alphabetically)

- Brian Vaughn, First 5 Sonoma County

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

- Susan Castillo, Department of Health Services
- Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
- Rob Halverson, Probation Department

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
<p>Welcome, Introductions, Minutes</p>	<p>Introductions.</p> <p>To assist with the staffing transition, the Human Services Department plans to contract with someone to support the Portfolio including facilitating the meetings. We are planning to contract with B.J. Bischoff to manage the Portfolio Review Committee. Marla Stuart will be retained on contract as a thought leader.</p> <p>Corrections to the Minutes: Minutes should say Larissa has been promoted to <i>the</i> probation department.</p> <p>Motion to approve the minutes, with corrections.</p>	<p>Motion: Dan</p> <p>Second: Carlos</p> <p>Yes: 12</p> <p>No: 0</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Updates & Reports</p>	<p>Update on Portfolio activities since last meeting.</p> <p>Tackling Tough Skills is receiving Technical Assistance. Since our last meeting 4C's, CPI and Volunteer Center have also received Technical Assistance. Joni Thacher will follow-up with the programs that we are awaiting information from.</p> <p>CHOICE</p> <p>Most reviewers have not seen CHOICE's complete evaluation. CHOICE will submit to the Portfolio Review Committee as a program and, should it be approved, its sub-programs will be</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>A study session about fidelity will be added to the August agenda.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>listed on the portfolio as part of CHOICE.</p> <p><i>Suggested Revision:</i></p> <p><i>Many reviewers have not seen CHOICE's complete evaluation. CHOICE will submit to the Portfolio Review Committee as a program and, should it be approved, its sub-programs will need to submit their own application to be included on the Portfolio. However, if CHOICE is approved the sub-programs will be able to reference it in their Evaluation.</i></p> <p>First 5 and Positive Parenting Programs</p> <p>Upstream may conduct a study about child maltreatment rates for Triple P recipients</p> <p>Because Positive Parenting Programs is a Tier 1 program and requires fidelity monitoring, First 5 will offer fidelity support to the Positive Parenting Program providers.</p> <p>Fidelity is an evaluation approach that shows an organization is implementing their program according to the model standard. It can include control of delivery, time and process.</p>		
Applications	There are no programs to review this month.	None	None
Discussion Items: Logic Model	<p>Logic Model</p> <p>Committee reviewed <i>Sonoma County Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs DRAFT Logic Model</i>. Committee offered the following suggestions for changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> References need to be added. A footnote pointing readers to page 57 of the original report would also be acceptable. <p>Problem Statement Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Don't use the term "well documented." Problem: We have determined in our community there is the need to increase the number of programs using evidence informed practice. Solution: Develop a structure to increase the number of programs using evidence informed practice. <p>Inputs Discussion: (What allows us to be successful)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have a common value to use evidence based practices. Services providers are committed to doing the work required to submit to the portfolio. Revise first input to read: "Commitment by the Board of Supervisors to support Portfolio, and to support Appeal Committee decisions." <p>Assumptions Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The collective value held by funders around evaluation. Funders are increasingly funding the evaluation resources non-profits need. We expect to expand and sustain these practices. There is a collective community value around evaluation. 	None	Portfolio staff will make the suggested changes to the Logic Model and distribute for review.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services exist in our community. (This could also be an input). • Evidence-based models exist outside our community that can be replicated here. (This could also be an input). • Clearinghouses exist. (This could also be an input). • Research exists. (This could also be an input). • The Board of Supervisors’ support of Upstream, its decisions and expectations should be listed under assumptions. • There is an expectation in the County plan that Upstream’s principles will be upheld. • We are committed to being a public process. We are governed by the Brown Act and will be transparent. This could also be included under Inputs. <p>Output Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Portfolio Review Committee will document their process. • We are building collective/shared values. <p>Outcomes Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We will increase the size of the portfolio. • There will be more evidence informed practice in the community. • There will be a renewal process. • There will be a growing community will for the use of evidence based practices. • The committee’s knowledge will continue to grow. We are practicing Implementation Science and increasing our ability to do so. • We will add to the body of knowledge and should publish our work. • Services are more effective in addressing issues in the community. • There should be a footnote defining community conditions. The footnote should define or point to a definition that includes the 6 categories. • Service providers will increase their capacity. 		
<p>Discussion Items: Renewal Process</p>	<p>Renewal Process (brainstorming and discussion but no decisions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to find out what National Clearinghouses do for renewals. • If they are going to stay on the same tier, it should be easy. They should only supply documents if things have changed. <p>Tier 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 3 organizations should be sent reminders 24, 12, 6 and 3 months before their reapplication is due. To move up to Tier 2, they will have to submit a full Tier 2 application. • What if they don’t have the funds to do the evaluations? • Is it reasonable to assume that start-up organizations will have reliable strong evaluations after only 3 years? 		<p>The Upstream staff will review current evidence on review process. We will also find out what Tier the current organizations up for renewal are.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can we set up regular workshops to help Tier 3 organizations? We should prioritize the new Technical Assistant PPEA to help Tier 3 organizations. • It may take a while with tweaking and changes to establish evaluations and outcomes. If this is the case could we allow them to reapply as a Tier 3? • If they are going to reapply they will need to have used their data to restructure their program. There would need to be a new evaluation plan in place. They would also need to show an updated literature review and logic model. There would need to be a second evaluation in progress. • The easiest process would be to allow them to reapply for Tier 3. They would need to resubmit everything and include a one page summary of the changes they've made since their original application to reflect self-reflection and learning. <p>Tier 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reapplication should show that they are still on a Clearinghouse list. • They need to show fidelity. If there have been adaptations to the model these should be clearly articulated. • Do we require self reflection? Changes in staff could make self reflection difficult. How can we capture the need for self reflection without being onerous? It is our role to encourage learning and growth? They need to acknowledge and reflect on the following changes: need of the population, resources, internal, external, evaluation results and current research. • If we are going to include self reflection at the time of renewal that needs to be included in the original instructions. To add a new element unfairly penalizes organizations that have been on the portfolio for a while. • From a funders and grant makers perspective, there is great value in self reflection. We want to see internal and external changes articulated. • Could we have a renewal cover page? If we do it should be scored otherwise they are unlikely to put much effort into it. • We could create a new "Tier 1 Plus" category for programs that have been renewed. It would show longevity. • Our requirements should ultimately help the organization be more effective as they serve the public. <p>Tier 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They should be able to reapply with a cover sheet that articulates all changes (literature review, logic model, manual, evaluation). • To remain at Tier 2 do you need to have a local evaluation if your original evaluation was external? 		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to continue to grow and change as the Portfolio Review Committee. This is an opportunity for us to increase standardization for Tier 2. • We need to see that evaluation has continued. How often? Annually? Every 3 years? • What if an organization loses funding after their initial Tier 2 approval and they no longer have the funds for evaluation? Will we require a new evaluation to stay at the Tier 2 level? • They should be able to reapply. We will continue to grow and make changes to the Tier 2 application process. It will become increasingly rigorous. It won't be the same as it was 3 years prior. They will be held to the new standard and evaluated by a new set of eyes. Three years of changes may push them off of Tier 2. If their own practices haven't evolved their old evaluation won't measure up. Their application will speak for itself. • However, if they aren't approved for Tier 2 status after they reapply we need to be prepared to tell them why. • We need to review our goals as a committee. We are trying to continually up the ante on evidence informed service in our community. We must build into our system increased rigor for local evaluations. For Tier 2 this should include a time frame for evaluations. Three years would be reasonable. 		
<p>Discussion Items: Manual</p>	<p>Manual</p> <p>Page 11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – We need to establish a shared expectation for when a reviewer can deny a review. It would be reasonable to deny a review if you are 5 business days away from a vacation. – Does everyone get 1 “skip” per year? (no) – Why don't we give Joni or Caryn notice if we're going to be out of town for an extended period of time. (no) – We could all select a month during which we would be responsible for all the reviews that came in. (no) – You should decline the review if you know you can't make it to the meeting. (yes) <p>Page 12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments need to be able to be presented to the applicant. They should be courteous and promote further growth and learning. <p>Page 13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee members should get the reviewers score cards before the meeting. 		<p>Upstream staff to send a revised manual for review.</p>

Next Meeting	The next meeting will be on August 21. The location has not been determined, watch for an email with instructions.	None	Upstream staff to send information about location.
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:30 pm.	None	None