



## Portfolio Review Committee Agenda

September 16, 2015 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](http://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](mailto:Upstream@schsd.org) or call 707.565.8797.

- 1:00 Welcome, Introductions, Minutes - ACTION ITEM**  
*Review and approve August minutes*
- 1:05 Updates & Reports**  
*Update on Portfolio activity*
- 1:15 Reviewer Capacity – ACTION ITEM**  
*Discuss proposed timeline for reviewing submissions and returning recommendations*
- 1:45 Logic Models – Purpose and Expectations**  
*Establish common expectations for logic models included in Tier 2 & 3 submissions*  
*Long term indicators and literature reviews*
- 2:15 Clearinghouse Criteria – ACTION ITEM**  
*What constitutes a clearinghouse?*  
*Does Stanford Patient Education Center qualify as an Upstream approved clearinghouse?*
- 2:55 Public Comment**
- 3:00 Adjourn**

### Upcoming Meetings

October 21, 2015,

November 18, 2015, December 16, 2015

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



Wednesday, August 19, 2015 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Conference Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

- Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
- Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
- Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way
- Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
- Karin Demarest, Community Foundation
- Kate Pack, First 5
- Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
- Megan Sirna, Human Services Department
- Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office
- Rebecca Wachsberg, County Administrator's Office

- Rob Halverson, Probation Department
- Serena Lienau, Violence Prevention Partnership

Staff (listed alphabetically)

- Allegra Wilson, Human Services Department
- Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services Department
- Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

- B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting

Public (listed alphabetically)

- Leah Benz, First 5

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
<b>Welcome, Introductions, Minutes</b>	Angie welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions. Motion to approve the minutes with corrections: Serena and Rebecca were listed twice.	Motion to approve the minutes: Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0	None
<b>Updates &amp; Reports</b>	<p>Angie provided an update of Technical Assistance since the last meeting. There were 8 new programs approved for the Portfolio since the last meeting. Tier 1: Coping Cat and Triple P; Tier 2: Court Appointed Special Advocates, Reach out and Read, Safe School Ambassadors and The Council; Tier 3: 2-1-1 and Neighborhood Listening Project. There are close to 100 programs on the Portfolio and staff is considering ways to celebrate when that number is reached.</p> <p>One goal for this year is to have a revamped, searchable online database to assist funders and donors in finding programs of interest to them. Upstream staff is also willing to assist when calls from funders and donors are received. The Portfolio will also be organized by Health Action categories: health, economic wellness, and education.</p>	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
<b>Measurement Tools Pilot Application- Action Item</b>	<p><b>Protective Factors Survey, CPI</b>  <b>Reviewers: All present</b>  Recusals : None</p> <p>This is the first Measurement Tool application and it is being used as a pilot. Angie shared the California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse website and their section on Measurement Tools.</p> <p>Kate provided background information on the Protective Factors Survey and why having it on the Portfolio would be useful. The tool is designed to look at aggregate data on resiliency in families. Encouraging agencies to use the same tool bolsters collective impact by providing shared measurements.</p> <p>The committee was given five minutes to read through the application with the scoring sheet.</p> <p>Discussion: Is it appropriate for the Portfolio Review Committee to review and approve measurement and assessment tools?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some on the committee felt that adding measurement tools to the Portfolio adds confusion to the process and could devalue the work of the Portfolio.</li> <li>• The group would prefer that shared measurement tools be included and recommended on the website and recommended through the Technical Assistance process.</li> </ul>	<p>Motion to have Technical Assistance integrate information and encourage programs to use evidence based assessment tools:</p> <p>Yes: 12  No: 0  Abstain: 0</p>	<p>Staff will reconvene with CPI and discuss different approaches to further shared measurement within the community.</p>
<b>Tier 1 and Measurement Tool Clearinghouse Review- Action Item</b>	<p>Joni shared the Stanford Patient Education Research Center and led a discussion about including it as a Tier 1 Clearinghouse. All of Stanford’s programs are small-group self-management programs in English and Spanish. License purchase and training are requirements for organizations to implement the programs and be listed by the clearinghouse. An implementer would need to complete a fidelity chart and be listed on Stanford Patient Education Research Center’s website. The programs have outside evaluation and are peer reviewed.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stanford only lists its own programs in its clearinghouse, and so it may not be neutral in the same way as a traditional clearinghouse.</li> <li>• Karin would like a recommendation from the Clearinghouse Review Workgroup or</li> </ul>	<p>None.</p>	<p>Staff will do more research on the Stanford Patient Education Research Center as a clearinghouse and on the definition of a clearinghouse. The clearinghouse and the larger issue of clearinghouse</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joni stated that the programs listed on the Stanford Patient Education Research Center meet Tier 1 criteria.</li> </ul>		approval will be revisited.
<p><b>Tier 2 Application and Renewal Forms- Action Item</b></p>	<p>The Committee reviewed staff recommendations for Tier 2 application and renewal forms. Joni shared the current language and let the committee know that staff encourages and anticipates revisions.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• New Tier 2 Scoring Sheet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Change “for reapplication” to “in short-term” in 2e.</li> <li>○ Add “Local” before “Outcomes” in 2e.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Renewal Tier 2 Scoring Sheet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Remove “short-term” from 5.</li> <li>○ Change 6 to “Are the outcomes acceptable?”</li> <li>○ Change 7 to ask about methods and analysis.</li> <li>○ Both 5 and 6 are required elements.</li> <li>○ Reword “Complete the following only if the submitted evaluation does not include local outcomes.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	None	Staff will bring an updated draft of the Tier 2 application and renewal forms to the next meeting.
<b>Public Comment</b>	None	None	None
<b>Next Meeting/Final Comments</b>	The next meeting will be held on September 16, 2015.	None	None
<b>Adjourn</b>	Adjourned at 3:00 pm.	None	None



## Update Report for the Portfolio Review Committee

September 16, 2015

To date 91 programs have been approved for tier placement on the Portfolio:

Tier 1: 26

Tier 2: 32

Tier 3: 33

### Approved for Portfolio inclusion since August 19, 2015 (program descriptions on back)

	Tier	Submitting Agency	Program	Received TA?
1	2	University of California Cooperative Extension	4-H Positive Youth Development	Yes
2	3	Teen Services Sonoma	Ready to Work	No
3	3	St. Joseph's Health	Healthy for Life	Yes

### Under Review

	Submitting Agency	Tier	Program	Received TA?
1	University of California Cooperative Extension	2	4-H Healthy Living	Yes
2	United Way of the Wine Country and partners	2	Earn It! Keep It! Save It!	No
3	University of California Cooperative Extension	2	4-H S.T.E.M.	Yes
4	Department of Health Services	2	Breastfeeding Peer Counseling	No

### 1:1 TA provided to renewal and active submissions since August 19, 2015 (continued on back)

	Last Action	Submitting Agency	Program	Status
1	9/11/15	Integrative Medical Clinic Foundation	Imagine You	Tier 3 - TA recommended
2	9/11/15	Stable Youth	Stable Youth	Tier 3
3	9/11/15	Human Services Department	A Matter of Balance	Tier 1 <i>renewal</i>
4	9/11/15	Santa Rosa Chamber	Mike Houser Algebra Academy	Tier 3
5	9/10/15	Northern California Center for Well Being	Healthier Living	Tier 1 possibly moving to Tier 2
6	9/10/15	Women's Recovery Services	Seeking Safety	Tier 1 <i>renewal</i>
7	9/4/15	River to Coast Children's Services	Child Care Home Education Network	Tier 3 moving to Tier 2
8	9/4/15	Social Advocates for Youth	Tackling Tough Skill Renewal	Tier 2 - TA recommended
9	9/4/15	Pets' Lifeline	Kids Speak for Pets	Tier 3
10	9/2/15	Mother's Care	Cognitive Behavioral Therapy	Tier 1
11	9/1/15	Farm to Table	TBD	Tier 3
12	8/31/15	Boys and Girls Clubs (all)	Project Learn	Tier 1 moving to Tier 2
13	8/31/15	River to Coast Children's Services	Child Care Home Education Network	Tier 3 moving to Tier 2
14	8/31/15	Boys and Girls Clubs (all)	SMART Moves	Tier 3 moving to Tier 2
15	8/28/15	Volunteer Center	Court Referral	Tier 2 or 3

Technical Assistance Summary Report, Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs (updated. 9/11/15)

For more information visit [www.UpstreamInvestments.org](http://www.UpstreamInvestments.org), contact [Upstream@schsd.org](mailto:Upstream@schsd.org) or call 565.8797.

	Last Action	Submitting Agency	Program	Status
16	8/28/15	Department of Health Services	Smoke Free Babies	Tier 2 or 3
17	8/27/15	Catholic Charities	Coach to Career	Tier 3
18	8/20/15	Josiah Rich Ministries	Operation Blanket	Tier 3

## Program descriptions for approved programs for Portfolio inclusion

### 4-H Positive Youth Development - University of California Cooperative Extension

Positive Youth Development (PYD) provides structured learning, encouragement and adult mentoring for young people participating in 4-H programs in Sonoma County. 4-H'ers are four times more likely to make contributions to their community, two times more likely to be civically active, two times more likely to make healthy choices than their peers.

### Ready to Work – Teen Services Sonoma

Teen Services Sonoma provides at-risk teens with work readiness services and on-the-job training, job placement services, and coaching, which instill confidence and empower them for employment and life success. They serve youth aged 14-24 and are the largest employer of teens in Sonoma Valley. Ready to Work offers hands on experiences at three micro-businesses and through on-the-job training (OJT) and job placement services. Teens gain real world experience and skills, paving an essential pathway to a positive start in the workplace.

### Healthy for Life – St. Joseph's Health

Healthy for Life is a school-based physical activity and nutrition program administered through the Community Benefit department of St. Joseph Health-Sonoma. Healthy for Life focuses on building school capacity to support healthy eating and physical activity among its students. This program includes teacher and staff training in evidence-based physical education (such as SPARK and CATCH), which provides tools to incorporate physical activity into classroom teaching along with nutrition education.



## **Definition of “Clearinghouse” for the Purposes of Tier One Upstream Portfolio Approval**

The Portfolio Review Committee has requested information to clarify the criteria for “approved” clearinghouses for Tier One applications to the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs. Upstream Investments staff conducted a scan of the field of Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) to understand the current practice and use of online resources commonly referred to as “clearinghouses”.

The expansion of resources about EBP has resulted in varying definitions of what qualifies as “evidence-based”. Two distinct types of online resources have been developed: 1) websites that list and often link the user to individual research studies, lit reviews and/or meta-analyses; and, 2) resources that employ some manner of objective and systematic grading system that rates the quality and rigor of the known research basis of a given program or practice. These review/rating systems are intended to minimize bias in the identification, assessment and synthesis of research results. In these systematic reviews, the review process and decision-making criteria are transparent and established in advance.

### **Online Resources for EBPs**

#### No Systematic Review of Evidence

- Websites developed by professional organizations, governments, research entities and other groups that list and/or link to research studies related to a specific field, but do not have a rating criteria that assesses the quality of the listed studies.
- Websites hosted by developers of specific curriculum, assessment tools, programs or frameworks that list and/or link to research studies related to the field, but do not have a rating criteria that assesses the quality of the listed studies. *Note: curriculum, tools, etc. may have an associated for-profit cost.*
- Online databases of evidence-based programs in identified fields (mental health, education, child welfare) that offer membership or other credential in an associated organization for a fee.

#### Systematic Review of Supporting Evidence

- Online databases/websites developed by governments, professional organizations, research entities and other groups that have clear rating criteria against which programs can be evaluated for rigor to assess the quality of the evidence and present the information in a way that is useful to decision-makers. In general, assessment of evidence quality is conducted by independent reviewers with research expertise in the particular field.

Typically called “clearinghouses”, online resources that employ review system share similar requirements for a program/practice to be rated as “evidence-based,” “proven,” a “model

program," etc. (See *Upstream Investments Approved Clearinghouses* for crosswalks of these dimensions for currently approved Tier One clearinghouses.) Common dimensions include:

- **Topical focus:** targeting a certain set of outcomes or target populations (i.e., children and families, mental health, juvenile justice)
- **Research design:** rating related to how research design affects the legitimacy of its results (i.e., RCTs, quasi-experimental, etc.)
- **Statistical significance:** threshold for statistical significance and effect size
- **Quality of outcome measures:** requirement that the outcome measures used have been established in the academic literature as valid measures
- **Publication or authorship requirements:** evaluation findings published in a peer-reviewed journal or independently conducted by individuals other than the program developers.
- **Replication:** initial program evaluation shows that a program is effective in that particular context, but a successful replication of the program shows that the program can be effective in other contexts.

**Sources:**

Websites

*Promising Practice Network*

*Social Work Policy Institute*

*What Works Clearinghouse*

*Cochrane Collaboration*

Publications

*"Evidence-Based Practice in Social Work", Soydan, H. & Palinkus, L.*