



Portfolio Review Committee Agenda

August 16, 2017 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

All supporting documents are available at www.UpstreamInvestments.org. For accessibility assistance with this agenda or supporting documents, please e-mail Upstream@schsd.org or call 707.565.8797.

- 1:00 Welcome, Introductions, Minutes - ACTION ITEM**
Review and approve March minutes
- 1:05 Updates & Reports**
Update on Portfolio activity
- 1:15 Upstream and Health Action Integration**
Overview of planned initiative integration and potential opportunities for the Portfolio
- 2:55 Public Comment**
- 3:00 Adjourn**

2017 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Dates:

*September 20,
October 18, November 15, December 20*

All meetings will be held from 1:00 – 3:00 pm at 520 Mendocino Ave in the Laurel Room unless otherwise noted.



Wednesday, March 15, 2017 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting
 Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
 Emmanuel Moon, United Way of the Wine Country
 Hannah Euser, County Administrator’s Office
 Kristen Fladseth, Department of Health Services
 Leah Benz, First 5
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department
 Teddie Pierce, Decipher HMIS

Staff (listed alphabetically)

Kellie Noe, Human Services Department
 Joni Thacher, Human Services Department
 Shannon Torres, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Alison Lobb, Child Parent Institute
 Dan Schurman, St. Joseph Health
 Karin Demarest, Community Foundation
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
 Matthew Ingram, Driving Force Consultant

Public (listed alphabetically)

Kathleen Koblick, Marin County
 Reuben Bates, Alameda County

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes – Action Item	<p>Kellie facilitated introductions and welcomed the committee members and public. The public members are Kathleen Koblick and Reuben Bates, who are observing Upstream and will base their BASSC project on Upstream Investments.</p> <p>Motion to approve the agenda was made by Leah Benz and seconded by Emmanuel Moon.</p> <p>Motion to approve the February minutes was made by Leah Benz and seconded by Carlos Ayala.</p>	<p>Motion to approve the agenda and minutes: Yes: All No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	None
Updates & Reports	<p>Kellie acknowledged Rob Halverson for his dedication to the Upstream Review Committee. This is his last meeting. Alison Lobb will be taking his place.</p>	None	None
NREPP Legacy Rating Scale - ACTION ITEM	<p><i>Consider revising standards for NREPP Legacy Program rating scale.</i></p> <p>Joni provided an overview of the Clearinghouse requirements and why they are used. Tier 1 of</p>	<p>Motion to approve the recommendation: Yes: All</p>	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>the Portfolio of Model Upstream programs requires that a program be listed on an evidence-based clearinghouse and implemented with fidelity in Sonoma County.</p> <p>The group looked at listings 12 and 13 on the Clearing house handout to review the SAMHSA National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices (NREPP). Tier 1 programs must have an overall rating of 2.5 or higher for all outcomes.</p> <p>Rob commented that the total score may pass, but not the individual categories.</p> <p>Carlos reminded the group that in the past, the criteria was that each program had to have a 2.5 in every category.</p> <p>B.J. inquired if the group has ever looked at each category and determined if one was a deal breaker, if the score is too low.</p> <p>The revised rating scale was approved last spring. It uses colors (green, yellow, and red), which determine which tier a program could be approved for, instead of a numerical rating. This rating system only looks at the overall score.</p> <p>Joni shared an example of the Housing First Program, which uses the NREPP Legacy Program numerical rating scale. They have a 2.4 score, which would not pass, because they are a tenth of a point too low. Joni proposed the question, can we make an exception in situations like this, where a program can be approved for Tier 2, if they are using the Legacy numerical rating scale. They would need to prepare a fidelity chart, but would not have to complete the entire Tier 2 application.</p> <p>Rob commented that he feels comfortable for a program to go to Tier 2 if they meet the majority of the category standards. The group agreed.</p> <p>Recommendation for NREPP Legacy programs:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1 programs must have an overall rating of 2.5 or higher for ALL outcomes. • Tier 2 programs must have an overall rating of 2.5 or higher for the majority of outcomes. If an overall outcome score is 2.4, these programs could apply for Portfolio inclusion by completing a fidelity table. 	<p>No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Motion to accept the recommendations was made by Leah Benz and seconded by Emmanuel Moon.</p>		
<p>CHOICE Evaluation Methodology – ACTION ITEM</p>	<p><i>Does the C.H.O.I.C.E. evaluation methodology meet Upstream Tier 2 criteria?</i></p> <p>Joni shared with the group a report from CHOICE, which is an evaluation conducted by Community Crime Prevention Associates for the City of Santa Rosa. The City has used the CHOICE evaluation methodology for 10 programs. One such program is Double Punches, which is currently in the application process, waiting to be reviewed.</p> <p>The group discussed if the CHOICE evaluation method is sufficient in meeting Upstream’s portfolio criteria.</p> <p>B.J. noted that the CHOICE report lists data statistics, rather than measured outcomes. This logic model is for CHOICE, not for Upstream. Rob agreed that there is not enough in this report for approval.</p> <p>After more discussion, the group agreed that the CHOICE handout did not provide sufficient information. It should reflect outcomes.</p> <p>BJ motioned that Upstream not use the CHOICE evaluations. The program could use components of the CHOICE evaluation, but would need to submit a portfolio application to match the original logic model and outcomes.</p> <p>Teddie seconded that motion.</p> <p>BJ also recommended doing some group coaching for all the programs that use the CHOICE method so that they can submit the proper evaluations and data to Upstream.</p> <p>Carlos seconded that recommendation. Everyone agreed.</p> <p>After further discussion, the motion was amended to grant a 3-year grace period for programs in this situation to put together an amendment to their evaluation that shows the clear linkage to the specific outcomes that they identified in their original logic model and evaluation plan, and</p>	<p>Motion to approve the recommendation: Yes: All No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	<p>Upstream staff will inquire with the City of Santa Rosa about changing the requirements of the CHOICE reports.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>how they are progressing on those outcomes.</p> <p>Motion to accept the recommendations was made by B.J. and seconded by Carlos.</p>		
Public Comment	None.	None	None
Next Meeting/Final Comments	The next meeting will be held on April 19, 2017.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 2:29 pm.	None	None