



## Portfolio Review Committee Agenda

February 19, 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.  
520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

All supporting documents are available at [www.SonomaUpstream.org](http://www.SonomaUpstream.org) and at the Board of Supervisors office at 575 Administration Drive, Room 100A, Santa Rosa, CA, during normal business hours. For accessibility assistance with this agenda or supporting documents, please e-mail [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org) or call 707.565.5800.

- 1:00 Welcome, Introductions, Applications to the Portfolio ACTION ITEM**  
*Tier 2 Girls Circle*  
*Issue(s) for discussion: Literature Review, Logic Model, Manual, and Evaluation*  
*Public Comment*
- 2:00 Minutes ACTION ITEM**  
*Review and approve December minutes*
- 2:10 Updates & Reports**  
*Update on portfolio activity since last meeting*
- 2:20 T.A. Introductory Package**  
*Review "Intro to T.A." package*
- 2:25 Public comment**
- 2:30 Adjourn**

### Upcoming Meetings

March 19, 2014, April 16, 2014

May 21, 2014 June 18, 2014 July 16, 2014 August 20, 2014

September 17, 2014 October 15, 2014 November 19, 2014 December 24, 2014

**All meetings will be held from 1:00 – 2:30 pm at 520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa in the Laurel Room**



Wednesday, December 18, 2013 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

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  
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department  
 Robert Judd, Community Foundation  
 Stephen Jackson, SCOE

Staff (listed alphabetically)

Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services Department

Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University  
 Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way  
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department  
 Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa

Public (listed alphabetically)

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting  
 Phyllis Rosenfield, Listening for a Change  
 Renee Tolliver, Listening for a Change

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
<b>Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, Updates</b>	Angie welcomed everyone.  <b>Motion to approve the minutes.</b>  Carol requested that reviewers be notified if the program they’re reviewing is approved or denied.	Motion to approve the minutes: Dan Second: Rob Yes: 7 No: 0 Abstain: 0	Staff will notify reviewers of Portfolio placement.
<b>Transfer Process</b>	<b>Angie summarized the need to establish a process for transferring Portfolio programs when organizations merge.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The committee decided that transfers should be handled on a case by case basis. If questionable adaptations have been made to the program it will be added to the next agenda and discussed by the committee.</li> </ul> Stephen arrived at 1:22.	None	None
<b>Application to the Portfolio</b>	<b>Neighborhood Listening Project</b> Stephen and Dan reviewed the program. Points for discussion: Literature Review and Evaluation.		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Robert recused himself.</p> <p>Stephen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Literature Review was significant, but limited in connection to the actual program until the end at which point it discussed several studies related to finding success through empathy and social skills gained through interviewing. The four or five studies cited were adequate, although the connection was challenging to make.</li> <li>• It was even more challenging to find the connection in the evaluation. The program surveyed students before and after the interview process. The evaluation was actually done on the Clean and Sober program not on the schools they worked with locally. Stephen thought that the evaluation was appropriate enough. He noted that the Neighborhood Listening Project is an exceptional program, but could understand why there would have been questions.</li> </ul> <p>Dan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is an excellent program. It's very well laid out and well written. However, there were too many grey areas in the literature review. There was too big a focus on funds of knowledge that were mostly teachers or other personnel doing that research. In the program the students are doing the research. The literature review would have benefited from a clear statement of the subject and a summary of what is known or not known about the topic.</li> <li>• In the evaluation there were a number of questions that may not have offered good pre-information to determine if the program is working. The CHOICE grant information at the end was not detailed or specific enough for Tier 2 placement. The data at the end of the application does not overwhelmingly demonstrate program success.</li> </ul> <p>Stephen:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The decision to approve this program came from the answers the students gave in the pre and post tests. The pre questions were not as specific as they could have been, but the answers were so profound it merited Tier 2.</li> </ul>		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p><b>Public Comment:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phyllis: Thanked the Committee for their consideration. Regarding the literature review they were initially told to send in 5 – 8 scholars and that’s what they wrote up. Later they were told to turn in the entire literature review/thesis which is why it’s disconnected. It’s using funds of knowledge so that the students become the ethnographer.</li> <li>• Phyllis stated that she did not like the Review Committee’s format. They needed more time to prepare. Phyllis requested additional time to defend their program.</li> <li>• Angie granted all members of the public 6 minutes to speak.</li> <li>• Phyllis: The evaluation is open ended. CHOICE was all about checking boxes They are constantly refining this.</li> </ul> <p>Renee Tolliver:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Renee described her work on the Upstream application. She noted that the literature review and evaluation were there to inform the program. The program design is a result of Phyllis’ research. They were advised during a technical assistance session to include the literature review and evaluation exactly as they appeared. An outside evaluation with their limited resources would have been more than they could handle.</li> <li>• In regards to the evaluation not being overwhelmingly successful she noted that the purpose of the evaluation was to see where gaps were, not show perfection.</li> </ul> <p>B.J. Bischoff:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• B.J. read from her Technical Assistance Log as it related to the Neighborhood Listening Project. Her log reflected that she had advised Listening for a Change to include pages from the master’s thesis, not the entire thesis. She had recommended changes to the logic model. She also advised that they submit a standalone evaluation. This could have been blended from the master’s thesis.</li> </ul> <p><b>Additional Committee Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is an extraordinary program.</li> <li>• The literature review is fine. The purpose of the literature review is to discuss what is</li> </ul>		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>known and not known. The master’s thesis does this.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Our committee requires an evaluation be tied to a logic model. I scripted out the outcomes and how this program addresses those. There is a shift in empathy and positive experience. I would caution that the pre-test needs to say it asks those questions. Pre-questions are skill questions. Post-questions are changes of the outcomes. The evaluation shouldn’t inform the program, it should show that it was successful in its design. I think it minimally has the components of what it needs. The evaluation needs to be tightened up.</li> </ul> <p>Katie motioned to deny Tier 2 and recommend technical assistance.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Dan said he was persuaded that the literature review was acceptable. He recommended a motion to deny the program but note that the literature review was acceptable.</li> <li>Angie reminded the Public and Committee that Tier 3 is not a lower grade. Our goal is not to be punitive. The Tier design is intended to model the clearinghouses that are already out there. Tier 2 requirements mirror clearinghouse requirements.</li> </ul> <p><b>The committee denied Tier 2 placement and recommended technical assistance.</b></p> <p>Renee and Phyllis left.</p> <p><b>Further committee discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Public comment turned into a question and answer session. The public needs to be aware that when their 3 minutes is up there is no further comment allowed. They are not part of the discussion.</li> <li>We may need to put a technical assistance disclaimer into place.</li> <li>The pre and post tests really didn’t line up. Student responses suggested change, but the methodology was not there.</li> <li>There was nothing in the literature review that discussed things that may not work.</li> </ul>	<p>Motion to deny Tier 2 placement and recommend technical assistance related to the evaluation: Katie  Second: Carol  Yes: 5  No: 2  Abstain: 1</p>	<p>Staff will provide technical assistance as needed.</p> <p>Staff will develop a technical assistance disclaimer.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	There was an incredible issue of bias.		
<b>Meeting Purpose</b>	<p><b>What is the best use of the committee's time? Would you like to meet if there are no applications to review?</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The committee decided to meet if there was a significant issue to discuss or if there was an application up for review. They also decided to shorten the meetings unless the full 2.5 hours was necessary to come to a decision.</li> </ul>	None	None
<b>Final Thoughts</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The committee requested that the wording on the score sheet be changed from "acceptable outcomes" to "positive outcomes."</li> <li>An application can be denied if the reviewer knows that the most current research is not being used.</li> </ul>	None	<p>Staff will change the language on the score sheets.</p> <p>Joni will email the Committee a link to the evaluation source that Carlos provided in November.</p> <p>As programs are approved Joni will send them to Dan to be included on the Cradle to Career website.</p>
<b>Public Comment</b>	None at this time.	None	None
<b>Next Meeting/Final Comments</b>	The next meeting will be on January 15, 2014 at 520 Mendocino Ave.	None	None
<b>Adjourn</b>	Adjourned at 3:00 pm.	None	None



# UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

## Update Report for the Portfolio Review Committee

February 2014

To date 71 programs have been approved for tier placement on the Portfolio:

Tier 1: 23 programs  
 Tier 2: 26 programs  
 Tier 3: 22 programs

85 organizations *implementing* programs on the Portfolio  
 48 local organizations *funding* programs on the Portfolio

### Programs added to the Portfolio since December 18, 2013

	Approval Date	Program	Tier	Submitting Agency
1	12/26/13	Expressive Arts Peer Grief Support Groups for Youth	3	WillMar Family Grief and Healing
2	1/6/14	School Based Mentoring	3	Sonoma Valley Mentoring Alliance
3	1/9/14	Seneca Wraparound	1	Seneca Family of Agencies
4	1/15/14	Kid Scoop News	3	Kid Scoop News
5	1/21/14	Seneca Unconditional Care Model	3	Seneca Family of Agencies
6	1/24/14	Triple P <i>Renewal</i>	1	California Parenting Institute
7	1/27/14	Interpersonal Psychotherapy for Perinatal Mood/Anxiety Disorders	1	California Parenting Institute

### Activity related to active submissions since December 18, 2013

	Submission Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Activity Date	Status
1	2/11/14	Nurse-Family Partnership <i>Renewal</i>	Department of Health Services	2/11/14	Under Review
2	12/5/13	Neighborhood Listening Project	Listening for a Change	2/7/14	Technical Assistance
3	4/29/13	El Puente	LifeWorks of Sonoma County	1/22/14	Technical Assistance
4	12/11/13	Girls Circle	Jewish Children and Family Services	1/8/14	Committee decision needed (2/19/2014)

Note: HSD staff also provides assistance to organizations preparing their applications. This assistance is reflected in the following table. The activity reflected here begins with a Portfolio submission.

**Renewal T.A. provided to organizations currently included in the Portfolio:**

	Expiration Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Activity Date	Status
1	9/15/16	Youth and Family Development through Martial Arts	MAYi	2/13/14	Technical Assistance

**Applications in progress but not submitted:**

	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Communication
1	TBD	Action Network	2/13/14
2	TBD	Committee on the Shelterless	2/6/14
3	211	Volunteer Center	1/22/14
4	HEALTHY Ideas	Older Adult Collaborative	1/8/14
5	Ceres Community Project	Youth Mentoring and Healthy Meals	10/25/13
6	Partners for Change Outcome Management System (PCOMS), Therapeutic Behavioral System (TBS)	Seneca Centers	10/25/13
7	Literacy Connection	Volunteer Center of Sonoma County	10/24/13
8	TBD	Sonoma Valley Teen Services	9/6/13

**Submissions with no activity since December 18, 2013**

	Submission Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Activity Date	Status
1	10/25/13	Recreation and Parks Afterschool Program	City of Santa Rosa	10/25/13	Technical Assistance
2	10/25/13	Recreation and Parks Neighborhood Services Sports Program	City of Santa Rosa	10/25/13	Technical Assistance
3	6/7/13	Triple P Parenting	Russian River Counselors	9/2/13	Awaiting info from applicant
4	4/15/13	Motivational Interviewing	Sunny Hills Services	5/16/13	Awaiting info from applicant
5	4/3/13	CYO-Street Outreach Program	Breakout Prison Outreach dba California Youth Outreach	5/15/13	Awaiting info from applicant
6	2/5/13	Head Start	Community Action Partnership	2/22/13	Awaiting info from applicant
7	9/24/12	HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Interfaith Shelter Network	9/31/12	Awaiting info from applicant
8	9/3/12	Health Kids Sonoma County	Redwood Community Health Coalition	12/14/12	Awaiting info from applicant
9	6/29/12	Play Therapy	Petaluma People Services Center	9/25/12	Awaiting info from applicant
10	6/20/11	The Toolbox Project	Dovetail Learning, Inc.	7/13/12	Awaiting info from applicant