Portfolio Review Committee Agenda

September 21, 2016 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m.
520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room (2nd Floor)

All supporting documents are available at www.UpstreamInvestments.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 Upstream@schsd.org or call 707.565.8797.

1:00   Welcome, Introductions, Minutes - ACTION ITEM
Review and approve April minutes
Welcome new Review Committee members:
- Kristen Fladseth, Department of Health Services
- Susan Stark, Sheriff's Office
- Daniel Schurman, St. Joseph Health
- Teddie Pierce, Decipher HMIS
- Emmanuel Moon, United Way of the Wine Country

Oaths of Office:
- Daniel Schurman
- Teddie Pierce
- Emmanuel Moon
- Matthew Ingram
- Carlos Ayala
- B.J. Bischoff

1:10   Updates & Reports
Update on Portfolio activity
Inform Committee on Upstream Board Report and Presentation outcomes

1:25   Application to the Portfolio - ACTION ITEM
North Bay Organizing Project, North Bay Organizing Project
Items in question: Literature Review, Logic Model
Reviewers: B.J. Bischoff and Hannah Euser

1:55   Learning for Action Recommendations
Review recommendations emerging from LFA Evaluation

2:15   Public Comment

2:20   Adjourn

Upcoming Meetings
October 19, 2016, November 16, 2016, December 21, 2016
All meetings will be held from 1:00 – 3:00 pm at 520 Mendocino Ave in the Laurel Room unless otherwise noted.

Wednesday, April 20, 2016 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

Members (listed alphabetically)
Alison Lobb, Child Parent Institute
B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting
Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
Leah Benz, First 5
Rob Halverson, Probation Department
Staff (listed alphabetically)
Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services Department

Helen Simi, Human Services Department
Joni Thacher, Human Services Department
Not Present (listed alphabetically)
Hannah Euser, County Administrator's Office
Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
Matthew Ingram, Driving Force Consultant
Public (listed alphabetically)
Karin Demarest, Community Foundation

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes – Action Item	Angie welcomed everyone. Motion to approve the March minutes was made by Leah Benz and seconded by Julie Sabbag-Maskey.	Motion to approve the minutes: Yes: 5 No: 0 Abstain: 0	None
Updates & Reports	There are no new programs approved to the Portfolio since the March PRC meeting. Angie provided an update on new programs **under review** for the Portfolio since the last meeting: • Tier 2 – **Child & Adult Care food Program** – 4Cs • Tier 3 – **Grade Level Proficiency Program** – Sonoma Valley Education Foundation; and **Imagine You** - Integrative Medical Clinic Foundation.	None	None
NREPP Revised Review Process - ACTION ITEM	***Continue discussion on the NREPP Revised Review Process to approve the Portfolio criteria for new NREPP program rating scale.*** Joni provided an overview of the Legacy rating system and the revised rating scale. A comparison	Motion to approve the recommendation: Yes: 5 No: 0	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps

	was provided between the old and new rating systems for clarity.
	
	Last time, Committee recommended that programs rated effective (green) for all outcomes can apply for Tier 1, and all of the programs rated promising (yellow) for all outcomes can apply for Tier 2. However, Joni points out that of the 42 effective programs on the SAMHSA clearinghouse, only 19 have all effective ratings; of the 39 promising programs, only 14 have all promising ratings.
	
	Recommendations:
	• For programs with a straight rating:
	  • Programs rated "**Effective**" meet **Tier 1** criteria for Portfolio applications.
	  • Programs rated "**Promising**" meet **Tier 2** criteria for Portfolio applications
	  • *Both tiers could apply for the Portfolio by submitting a completed fidelity chart.*
	• For programs with a mixed rating:
	  • Programs with more effective ratings for outcomes than promising ratings meet Tier 1 criteria for Portfolio applications.
	  • Programs with less effective ratings for outcomes and more promising ratings meet Tier 2 criteria for Portfolio applications.
	  • *Either rating may include an X (ineffective) if there is no evidence of harm.*
	  • *Both tiers could apply for the Portfolio by submitting a completed fidelity chart.*
	
	Discussion ensued to clarify if the Tier rating will be based only on identified, targeted outcomes or the collective outcomes ratings.
	
	Do we care to prioritize the outcomes? At this time, that will be too much for implementers to indicate on their applications.
	
	Can it still qualify for Tier 1 if they have more than 1 X? If they are effective for their desired outcomes, it should still qualify for Tier 1.
	
	Will there be enough info from application to know if the ineffective ratings are not a part of their targeted outcomes? This will need to be addressed by the implementer in their program description in their application.
	
	It is recommended that the implementer to specify and identify in their application their
		Abstain: 0	

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	intended and targeted program outcomes and how they align with effective outcomes identified in the clearinghouse. Motion to accept the recommendations was made by Karin Demarest and seconded by Carlos Ayala.		
New Members	Alison Lobb and Hannah Euser took the Oath of Office per Maddy regulations.		
Learning for Action Evaluation Update	*Review themes emerging from key informant interviews from the LFA evaluation in progress.* Angie shares that we have contracted with LFA to conduct a 3rd party interim evaluation of systems impact of Upstream Investments. There have been Key Informant Interviews with the Board, critical stakeholders and backbone staff. LFA has reviewed internal documents and engaged CBO and department heads in focus groups. LFA is evaluating from a collective impact lens for research questions. Reflection sessions with staff and several key stakeholders (committee members). LFA will make final recommendations based on their evaluation and staff will bring some recommendations to BOS in August. The Committee discussed Upstream ad Health Action alignment. Karin gave an overview of how HA, UI and Cradle 2 Career live in a symbiotic relationship and in ways in which they live in their own space. Karin cautioned against allowing UI to be absorbed into HA as we work on deeper alignment. Karin recommended staff send out to the Committee the calendar appointments for the Health Action Quarterly meetings and the Cradle2Career Steering Council meetings. BJ would like a link to minutes for both meetings. There is a lot of cross-pollination that occurs throughout all of these initiatives and committees. This makes the County unique and sets us up in a strong and unique direction going forward. Rob suggests that the evaluation piece can possibly be contracted out and/or we could ask funders to take an "evaluation pledge." The onus of the evaluation should fall on the funder. One challenge is that the TA manager and Reviewers are not always content experts, which leads to the challenge of asking the right questions. Additionally, the person who may be the expert in a field often times have to recuse themselves which leads to a withholding of valuable information to make the best informed decisions.	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Prioritizing Technical Assistance	*How should staff prioritize Technical Assistance?* Current status of TA Caseload: • 50 organizations representing • 70 Portfolio applications currently need TA **For the Committee's consideration:** What purpose does the Portfolio serve and should it change? What should be the focus and priority for limited TA? What would expanded capacity for TA look like? Staff is asking for recommendations from the PRC for prioritization. Suggestions: • If an org has previously received TA, they should go the back of the line. (This could work, but different organizations have different capacities and the learning curve can be drastically different). • Orgs are already required to attend a boot camp/training, but we can provide group trainings/classes in multiple successions with a timeline and deadlines. This would also keep the process fair and available to more organizations. • Organizations should be encouraged to provide training and support to their own staff. • Looking within our own community for experts who can lend support to the process with some incentives. This may not hold the same credibility and comfortability as reaching out to a County employee or paid, dedicated staff to provide this support. • Try to tease out Joni's time from the TA process where she is more assisting the process and not doing the workload. However, Joni almost never sees an application that is submitted that does not need TA, even for applicants who have gone through the process before. • Provide organizations with an exemplary application accessible online for them to see before they even begin the process. • Provide live, webinar trainings and an archive for review.		
RDA Cost Benefit Analysis	*What are the implications for Upstream and the Portfolio?* Angie provided background and Sonoma County context on RDA's CBA.		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	Upstream Investments Mission: *Facilitate the implementation of prevention-focused policies and interventions that increase equality and <u>reduce monetary and societal costs</u> for all residents of Sonoma County.* CBA asks: Is a given evidence-based program producing sufficient benefits for Sonoma County to outweigh the costs of delivering? Perry Preschool in the Long Run: • *$1.46 saved* by Sonoma County for every *$1.00 spent* on the Perry Preschool program.		
Public Comment	None.	None	None
Next Meeting/Final Comments	The next meeting will be held on May 18, 2016.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:05 pm.	None	None