Agenda Packet Table of Contents

Portfolio Review Committee Agenda

September 18, 2013 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

All supporting documents are available at 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 or call 707.565.5800.

1:00   **Welcome, Introductions, Agenda ACTION ITEM**
Approve Minutes with revisions from August meeting

1:10   **Updates & Reports**
Update on portfolio activity since last meeting
Update on Renewal Process Progress

1:20   **Logic Model ACTION ITEM**

1:30   **Applications to the Portfolio ACTION ITEM**
MAYi

1:40   **Discussion Items**
Fidelity
Evaluation requirements

3:15   **Public comment**

3:30   **Adjourn**

<div align="center">

Upcoming Meetings
October 16th, 2013, 520 Mendocino Ave
November 20th, 2013, 520 Mendocino Ave
December 18th, 2013, 520 Mendocino Ave

</div>

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

Wednesday, August 21, 2013 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

1202 Apollo Way, Santa Rosa, Shiloh Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University

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

Robert Judd, Community Foundation

Stephen Jackson, SCOE

Staff (listed alphabetically)

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting

Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Oscar Chavez, Human Services Department

Public (listed alphabetically)

Michael Wright

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Alfredo Perez, First 5 Sonoma County

Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way

Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department

Rob Halverson, Probation Department

Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa

Susan Castillo, Department of Health Services

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes	Introductions. Oscar welcomed everyone. B.J. has temporarily resigned her Review Committee Membership. She has contracted with the Human Services Department to run the Portfolio until a program development manager is hired. At that point she will resume membership on the Review Committee. While we wait for Dan and Stephen let's review updates to the Portfolio and the Clearinghouse Renewal Process summary. There are no new programs to review this month. YWCA, MAYi, Russian River Counselors and the Goodwill are all receiving technical assistance. We anticipate submissions from 3 – 4 agencies in the next 1 – 2 months. B.J. continues to work on the manual. Today's discussion on fidelity will inform a white paper that will be included in the manual. We also need to have a discussion on Tier 2 requirements. This will be added to the September agenda. Over the last month we researched Clearinghouse processes for program renewal. The American Diabetes Association Education Recognition Program has the most rigorous standards. The ADA requires programs reapply every 4 years or be removed from the Clearinghouse. They also		Upstream staff will include a discussion of Tier 2 requirements on the September agenda.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	audit 5% of all approved programs. Renewal applications should be submitted a minimum of 30 days before the program's expiration date. The remaining Clearinghouses take it upon themselves to monitor current research and periodically revisit interventions. Based on the research a program may be elevated, removed or allowed to remain in the same standing. We reviewed this information to inform our decisions around the renewal process. Dan and Stephen arrived. **Motion** to approve the minutes, with corrections.	Motion: Robert Second: Carlos Yes: 8 No: 0 Abstain: 0	
Action Items	**Logic Model** The Logic Model an action item because it guides our work. The version you have today reflects the edits you suggested over the last month. **Discussion**: Problem Statement: • For the sake of clarity you should add Problem 1/Solution 1and Problem 2/ Solution 2 to the Problem Statement. • You should add *costly* to "confusing and complex" in Problem Statement 2. • The purpose of a Logic Model is to prevent drift from our goals. Environmental Factors: • The words "resistant" and "unwilling" are used in Environmental Factors. Could we replace these with reasons why organizations would be resistant and the Board would be unwilling? • It's not that the Board is unwilling but that they need justification. Does the evidence for support exist? • Political winds may shift regardless of the evidence. • We could say: "Political and other factors can impact the Board's willingness to support decision…" • Service providers might be resistant for a variety of reasons. We need to give a basis for their resistance. • Let's use more neutral language: "Challenges may include the following: Service providers' incorporation of evidence into their practice; Funders' use of the Portfolio as a funding criteria; The Board of Supervisors' support of decisions made by the Review		

Upstream Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes for 8/21/13, Sonoma County Human Services Department (565-5800)
Author Joni Thacher

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	Committee and/or the Appeal Committee." Inputs: • There is an unstated assumption that we have a collective commitment to Technical Assistance. We believe providing Technical Assistance will improve organizational capacity. • Technical Assistance should be an Output. Inputs and Outputs • Change the second Input bullet to read: "Commitment by funders to use evidence informed practice and the Portfolio as the basis for one of their funding criteria." • Is there a place to include our sectors, e.g., health, justice, community, etc.? • If we go back to our purpose it would be inappropriate to list our sectors. This should be left in the by-laws. • Let's change Input bullet number three to read: "Private and organizational volunteers *representative of Sonoma County…*" Short Term Outcomes: • Is it redundant to say "promote replication and expand referrals"? • Promoting replication is more philosophical. It shows scalability. • Should referrals be listed under "Funders"? • Referrals should move to "Service Providers". • Funders need to stop applying band aids and start looking at how to prevent costs. • We need to say that we will consistently add active Portfolio members. If we're doing it right we should see an increase in the Portfolio. • Should there be an input or output related to training Technical Assistants and education for us on the Review Committee? • An input is that we have these dialogues and are educated through them. • Should there be an input or output that we are trained and engaging in ongoing professional learning activities? • Yes, that would be an output. Intermediate and Long Term: • Higher Education should actually be two separate outcomes: Higher education *access* and Higher education *completion*. • We need to revise the language of the indicators. There should be arrows before each indicator to specify an increase or decrease. • It would be easier to break the indicators into Increase and Decrease categories than to use arrows.		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	• We also need to include the long-term outcome that we expect to see investments increase in some departments and decrease in others. For example we expect to see greater investments in upstream programs and fewer investments in probation. • I don't know if it's up to us to include this long term outcome. We should only reflect the 22 indictors given to us by the Policy Committee. • It reflects what the Portfolio should look like. We could add to Intermediate Outcomes that we should see greater community investment in education and prevention. • In both Intermediate and Long Term Outcomes we need a systemic outcome. • Should we add the Long Term Outcome that Sonoma County will become the healthiest county by 2020? • Is our goal to enlarge institutions because they have answers that can help or to redirect and empower people? • An Intermediate Outcome is to increase investments in Upstream and evidence based practice. • A Long Term Outcome is that Sonoma County will invest in Upstream. • Who is this Logic Model for? Us. It's valuable in its ability to prevent drift. We ask other organizations to do this, we need to do it ourselves. • There is messiness to politics. If we are committed to telling a story through data it will make a difference and dispel myths. • We are not a static body, this Logic Model will prove useful for new committee members. • Service providers will look at this to see where they fit in. It needs to be clear if it is going to be used beyond this group. • There are too many changes to the Logic Model to approve it today. The Upstream Staff will make the edits we discussed and resubmit it for committee approval in September. **Renewal Process** B.J. summarized the proposed Tier 1renewal process and noted that 4 programs will expire from the Portfolio before the end of 2013. **Discussion**: Tier 1: • To clarify, the suggestion is that all tiers will submit an application using current forms? The only difference is that this time around they will check the renewal box at the top of the application. • I think contacting them at 24 months is too early. Let's not remind Tier 1 and Tier 2 programs until 18 months.		Upstream Staff will edit the Logic Model and submit for review in September. The status of

Upstream Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes for 8/21/13, Sonoma County Human Services Department (565-5800)
Author Joni Thacher

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	• If a program is dropped from a clearinghouse during their three years on the Portfolio can they finish out their 3 years or will they be immediately removed? This is a separate discussion we are only talking about the renewal process right now. • What will happen to organizations that don't reapply? Will we still list them publically somewhere? • Can we publically record all the programs ever listed? • We are creating a searchable database that will allow people to search for programs by funder, type of program, target audience, etc. We need to include past programs in this search. • We will always use current Clearinghouse information. The Clearinghouses will do the leg work for us. Organizations just have to show us that there program is still listed on the Clearinghouse. • If their program has changed they will need to show fidelity. • We need to continue to encourage development. Can an organization just submit to a Clearinghouse or do they need to show what they've done to progress, what they've done to move along their evidence based continuum? • We don't say anything about demonstrating forward progress in our current instructions so we shouldn't require reflection for renewal. It's not a requirement for new applicants so it shouldn't be a requirement for renewals. • There is value in asking them to self reflect. Isn't asking them to list changes and adaptation the same as asking for self reflection? • We need to revise the language in Tier 1, point 3: … "update to reflect changes in the program's fidelity and adaptations." • Why don't we add a line on the Tier 1 application form under fidelity that asks renewals to tell us about adaptations they may have made? • If we do that we should give specific example of adaptations they may have made. • On their renewal application the Clearinghouse will do the work for us. We don't need to see adaptations. • Yes, but don't we want them to address the issues and surprises they may have run into? What if we took a different perspective? Why don't we hold a convening with people who have renewed and ask them to reflect on their experience running a Tier 1 program? • How would asking these questions reflect our mission and how would we respond? What weight would we give their answers? Could a program be denied Tier 1 status based on their reflections?		programs removed from a Clearinghouse will be added to a later agenda. Joni will add history to our list of searchable criteria.

Upstream Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes for 8/21/13, Sonoma County Human Services Department (565-5800)
Author Joni Thacher

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	• When you're implementing an evidence based program the challenges are practical. Where will we get funding? How will we handle new employees that aren't trained? There is a learning curve and compliance can be costly. • We need to create a learning community, not make reflection part of the renewal process. • The onus is on us to give them feedback. It shouldn't only be about passing. • It's valuable for an organization to remain current. These steps can become time consuming. Are we competent to speak to these groups? Maybe reflection happens while they're receiving Technical Assistance? • Reflection could be a function of the Research Institute. This is the responsibility of the staff not the Review Committee. Not including mandatory reflection as a part of the renewal process doesn't suggest we have no interest in pushing them to improve, but it's not our responsibility. We can encourage growth without making it a criterion. • We need to go back to our Logic Model. It does not suggest that we should give this level of Technical Assistance. Tier 2: B.J. summarized renewal document. • Renewals will submit a new application. If their literature review is expired they will need to submit a new one. • Do evaluations expire? This is a conversation for another day. • We should make sure that at their 18, 12, and 6 month reminders we remind them that their literature review needs to be current. Tier 3 B.J. summarized renewal document. • Do we allow a grace period for Tier 3 programs? • I appreciate the language used in the renewal document. If an organization has implemented their Tier 3 evaluation plan they should be well staged to become a Tier 2 program. • Yes, but we still have to evaluate their evaluation. **Motion to approve the Renewal Process.** Further discussion: • Have we decided that there is no advantage to asking "What changes have you made in the last three years?" • What would the benefit be and could poor articulation expose them to tier denial? What weight would we give the question?	Motion: Stephen Second: Carlos	Upstream staff will add this discussion to a future agenda.

Upstream Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes for 8/21/13, Sonoma County Human Services Department (565-5800)
Author Joni Thacher

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	• I don't think we're ready to get that kind of information and use it effectively. It's not in our mission to develop evidence based thinking in our community. Until we have rationale for capturing this reflection information we need to evaluate them as a new application. **Renewals due in the next three months:** • What do we do with the four programs that will be up for renewal in the next four months? • The Tier 1's will be easy. We've talked with the Tier 3 and we think they're ready to move forward. They have an evaluation in place. • We need to give them a 6 -12 month grace period. • B.J. should call everyone and see if they have an evaluation in place. • We should give everyone due for renewal between now and August 2014 a 12 month grace period. Either they all get an additional 12 months on the Portfolio or we give them all until 12 months after the day we notify them to renew. • We want to delegate this decision to the Upstream staff. **Motion to authorize the Upstream staff to establish a grace period and revised expiration dates for programs expiring in the next 12 months.** **Time limit change** We would like to allow reviewers 5 days instead of three days to return their reviews. **Motion to allow reviewers 5 days to return applications.**	Yes: 8 No: 0 Abstain: 0 Motion: Carol Second: Katie Yes: 8 No: 0 Abstain: 0 Motion: Carol Second: Dan Yes: 8 No: 0 Abstain: 0	 Upstream staff will develop a renewal system for programs expiring in the next 12 months. Upstream staff will reflect this change in the Manual and By-laws.
Public Comment	B.J. opened the meeting up for public comment. Michael thanked the committee for their work and allowing him to listen to their process.	None	None
New Forms	We have revised the application and scoring forms, and would like your feedback. To allow for flexibility in the future this is not an Action Item. The staff needs to be able to make punctuation and grammatical corrections without committee approval. We would like to post the new forms on the website as soon as possible. We will take into consideration all of the change you suggest today and for the next three days. **Discussion**: • There is a formatting error on the Tier 1 application.	None	Upstream staff will make all recommended changes. Katie will review language used on scores sheets and

Upstream Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes for 8/21/13, Sonoma County Human Services Department (565-5800)
Author Joni Thacher

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	• Let's add the instructions on fidelity in the *Instructions* document to the chart. • Page numbers in the Instructions need to be corrected. • Could Katie review the language on the score sheets and give us feedback? • Katie would like a form to request an item be added to next month's agenda.		provide feedback. Joni will email Katie the agenda item request form.
Next Meeting	The next meeting will be on September 18 at 520 Mendocino Ave.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:32 pm.	None	None

Update Report for the Portfolio Review Committee
September 2013

Total number of programs approved to date for tier placement on the Portfolio:
Tier 1: 21 programs
Tier 2: 25 programs
Tier 3: 13 programs
Total: 59 programs

Number of organizations implementing or funding programs on the Portfolio: 71 organizations
Number of programs up for renewal before Dec 31, 2013: 5

Activity related to active submissions since July 17, 2013

	Submission Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Activity Date	Status
1	6/28/13	Triple P Parenting	YWCA	9/2/13	Technical assistance
2	6/19/13	MAYi	MAYi	9/9/13	Submitted 9/9/23
3	6/7/13	Triple P Parenting	Russian River Counselors	9/2/13	Technical assistance
4	5/17/13	Tackling Tough Skills	Goodwill Redwood Empire	9/6/13	Technical Assistance
5	4/29/13	El Puente	Life Works of Sonoma	6/24/13	Technical assistance

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

Applications in progress but not submitted:

	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Communication
1	TBD	4C's	9/10/13
2	TBD	CPI	6/24/13
3	TBD	Volunteer Center	6/24/13
4	TBD	Mentor Me Petaluma	9/9/13
5	Girl's Circle	Jewish Family Services	9/13/13
6	TBD	Sonoma Valley Teen Services	9/6/13

Summary Report, Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs (updated. 9.9.13)   Page 1

For more information visit www.SonomaUpstream.org, contact Info@SonomaUpstream.org, or call 565.5800.

Other active submissions with no activity since September 17, 2013

	Submission Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Activity Date	Status
1	5/9/13	Child Signature Program	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County	4/15/13	Awaiting info from applicant
2	4/18/13	WHEEL Early Literacy Program	Community Action Partnership	5/16/13	Awaiting info from applicant
3	4/15/13	Motivational Interviewing	Sunny Hills Services	5/16/13	Awaiting info from applicant
4	4/3/13	CYO-Street Outreach Program	Breakout Prison Outreach dba California Youth Outreach	5/15/13	Awaiting info from applicant
5	2/5/13	Head Start	Community Action Partnership	2/22/13	Awaiting info from applicant
6	9/24/12	HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Interfaith Shelter Network	9/31/12	Awaiting info from applicant
7	9/3/12	Health Kids Sonoma County	Redwood Community Health Coalition	12/14/12	Awaiting info from applicant
8	6/29/12	Play Therapy	Petaluma People Services Center	9/25/12	Awaiting info from applicant
9	12/20/11	Recreation and Parks Afterschool Program	City of Santa Rosa	9/12/12	Awaiting info from applicant
10	12/14/11	Recreation and Parks Neighborhood Services Sports Program	City of Santa Rosa	9/12/12	Awaiting info from applicant
11	6/20/11	The Toolbox Project	Dovetail Learning, Inc.	7/13/12	Awaiting info from applicant

Portfolio of Model Upstream Investments
Renewal Protocol for Programs Approved for Portfolio Inclusion Prior to August 21, 2013

Protocol for Portfolio Programs Expiring Prior to December 31, 2013

1. **By September 6, 2013, Portfolio staff will personally contact (via phone) the organization on the Portfolio Application Form for the 5 programs that expire before December 31, 2013.**

2. During this conversation, Portfolio staff will explain that the Portfolio Review Committee has developed a Program Renewal Policy stating that programs will expire from the Portfolio three years after their approval date and organizations will have to follow the renewal procedures for their programs to remain on the Portfolio. Portfolio staff explains that because their program is set to expire within the next three months, the PRC has recommended **an extension of up to six months**, if needed, for their program to submit a renewal application. Portfolio staff emails the Program Renewal Policy to each program representative, along with the appropriate Portfolio renewal forms, summarizes the phone conversation, asks what assistance the organization needs and asks when the organization plans to submit its renewal application. Portfolio staff provides TA as needed.

3. Organizations that do not submit a renewal application (according to the Program Renewal Policy) within 6 months after the original program expiration date will have their programs dropped from the portfolio.

Protocol for Portfolio Programs Expiring Between January 1 and August 30, 2014

1. **By September 13, 2013, Portfolio staff will personally contact (via phone) the person listed on the Portfolio Application Form for the 21 programs that expire between January 1 and August 31, 2014.**

2. During this conversation, Portfolio staff will explain that the Portfolio Review Committee has developed a Program Renewal Policy stating that programs will expire from the Portfolio three years after their approval date and organizations will have to follow the renewal procedures for their programs to remain on the Portfolio. Portfolio staff explains that because their program is set to expire within the next year, the PRC has recommended **an extension of up to six months,** if needed, for their program to submit a renewal application. Portfolio staff emails the Program Renewal Policy to each program representative, along with the appropriate Portfolio renewal forms, summarizes the phone conversation, asks what assistance the organization needs and asks when the organization plans to submit its renewal application. Portfolio staff provides TA as needed.

Renewal Protocol, Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs (updated. 9.9.13)   Page 1

For more information visit www.SonomaUpstream.org, contact Info@SonomaUpstream.org, or call 565.5800.

3. Organizations that do not submit a renewal application (according to the Program Renewal Policy) within 6 months after the original program expiration date will have their programs dropped from the portfolio.

Protocol for Portfolio Programs Expiring Between September 1, 2014 and May 30, 2016

1. **By September 13, 2013, Portfolio staff will send an email to the person listed on the Portfolio Application Form for the 34 programs that expire between September 1, 2014 and May 30, 2016.** The email will explain that the Portfolio Review Committee has developed a Program Renewal Policy stating that programs will expire from the Portfolio three years after their approval date and organizations will have to follow the renewal procedures for their programs to remain on the Portfolio. The Program Renewal Policy will be attached to each email sent. The email will mention that TA will be available from Portfolio staff as needed to assist organizations with their renewal applications.

2. Organizations that do not submit a renewal application (according to the Program Renewal Policy) within 3 years after the original program expiration date will have their programs dropped from the portfolio.

Protocol for Portfolio Programs Expiring After August 21, 2016

1. When organizations are notified via email that their programs have been approved for inclusion on the Portfolio, Portfolio staff will include the Program Renewal Policy as an attachment.

2. All organizations with programs approved after August 21, 2013 will be notified via email of their program's expiration date according to the notification times specified in the Program Renewal Policy.

3. Organizations that do not submit a renewal application (according to the Program Renewal Policy) within 3 years after the original program expiration date will have their programs dropped from the portfolio.

Renewal Protocol, Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs (updated. 9.9.13)   Page 2

For more information visit www.SonomaUpstream.org, contact Info@SonomaUpstream.org, or call 565.5800.

Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs LOGIC MODEL

Problem 1: The social/economic and family/individual factors that can pose extraordinary challenges and barriers to children, families, and individuals are complex, inter-related, consistent, and generally evident early in a child's life. **Solution 1**: Evidence-based prevention programs mitigate these challenges.

Problem 2: Incorporating evidence-informed practices within organizations can be confusing, complex, and costly. Moreover, the lack of standardized approaches to evidence-informed practice among funders and regulatory bodies can be burdensome to service providers. **Solution 2**: Develop and implement a standardized approach to implementing evidence-informed practice.

ASSUMPTIONS AND THEORIES that guide our thinking

- The social/economic and family/individual factors that contribute to social problems are well documented and can be successfully mitigated with programs informed by evidence.
- The Board of Supervisors continues to include the Upstream Investments Policy as a Board priority.
- County Departments, community partners, and local funders promote investing early, wisely, and together in their organizational practices including strategic planning, policy decisions, budgeting, resource deployment, and contracting.
- The Sonoma County community is committed to and does provide an array of public and private prevention services to community members experiencing challenging circumstances.
- The Sonoma County community of funders and service providers share a value for evidence-informed services and share a common understanding of the components of evidence-informed practice which are articulated in the Portfolio criteria.
- Evidence-based practices exist and are available for Sonoma County organizations to replicate. Other research and evaluation also exists and can be used by Sonoma County organizations to inform program design, implementation, and evaluation.
- Technical assistance received by service providers improves organizational capacity
- National evidence-based clearinghouses maintain current and growing lists of evidence-based practices.

- There is local collective commitment to providing a comprehensive technical assistance program to expand local capacity to implement evidence informed practices in program design, implementation, and evaluation.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS that may affect our success

Challenges may include the following:

- Service providers' incorporation of evidence into their practice
- Funders' use of the Portfolio as a funding criteria
- The Board of Supervisors' support of decisions made by the Review Committee and/or the Appeal Committee

SOURCES

- Greenwood, P. (2008). Prevention and Intervention Programs for Juvenile Offenders. *Future of Children, 18* (2), 203.
- Wolfe, B., Tefft, N. (2005). Child Interventions that may lead to Increased Economic Growth: A report to the Pew Charitable Trusts. *La Follette: The Policy Report 16,* (2), 12.
- Mason, P., Prior, D. (2009). *The Children's Fund and the prevention of crime and anti-social behavior* (Abstract DOI: 10.1177/1748895808092430), 282.
- Myers, D., Farrell, A. (2008). Reclaiming lost opportunities: Applying public health models in juvenile justice. *Children and Youth Services Review,* 30 (10), 1172.
- Orszag, P. (October 7, 2009). *Increased emphasis on program evaluations.* Memorandum for the heads of executive departments and agencies: Washington, DC: Office of Management and Budget.

INPUTS	OUTPUTS	OUTCOMES		
		SHORT TERM	**INTERMEDIATE**	**LONG TERM**

• Commitment by the Board of Supervisors to support Portfolio and Appeal Committee decisions.
• Commitment by funders to use evidence-informed practices and the Portfolio as the basis for their funding criteria.
• Private and organizational volunteers that are representative of Sonoma County who will commit the time necessary to serve on the Portfolio Committee.
• Staff to support the Portfolio (1 Admin Aide and 1 manager)
• Staff to provide technical assistance on evidence-informed practice to service providers
• Commitment by service providers to dedicate resources to submitting their programs to the Portfolio.
	The Portfolio Review Committee engages in the following activities:
	• Reviews applications and renewals to the Portfolio in accordance with the Portfolio Review and Decision Process and determine Tier Placement for each application.
	• Participates in ongoing professional learning activities
	• Publishes a list of programs that meet the criteria for each Tier.
	• Ensures that the Portfolio Submission Criteria and the Portfolio Review and Decision Process continue to meet County policy and accepted industry practices related to evidence-based practice
	• Maintains documentation that fully describes the committee's processes and change in thinking over time for the purpose of facilitating replication.
	• Promotes transparency and public accountability by ensuring opportunity for public access to and input to Portfolio activities.
		• The Review Committee members will continually increase their own knowledge of evidence-informed practice and will share this increased knowledge through Portfolio activities and within their own sphere of influence.
		• The number of submissions to the Portfolio and the number of approved programs on the Portfolio will increase.
		Local service-delivery providers will:
		• Improve their capacity to incorporate evidence in their program design, implementation and evaluation.
		• Increase their capacity to apply for and receive funding for prevention programs.
		• Deliver more evidence-informed prevention-based services.
		• Expand referrals to effective and cost beneficial prevention programs.
		Local funders will:
		• Identify local effective prevention programs and target funding and resources to these programs.
		• Promote replication and scalability of successful and cost beneficial prevention programs.
			• Children, families and individuals facing extraordinary challenges and barriers will be more likely to succeed as a result of increasingly more effective services.
			• Sonoma County will publish its experiences and contribute to the body of knowledge about implementation science.
			• Sonoma County public resources are invested in building social capital, resulting in more resources dedicated to supporting prevention-focused policies and interventions than in the need to fund existing community problems.
			The following risk factors will decline in the community:
			• **Societal and Economic**
			  • Poverty and Racial/Ethnic Disparities
			  • Adverse community conditions
			  • Punitive opinions, policies, and laws that advance incarceration over prevention
			• **Family and Individual**
			  • Family dysfunction
			  • Early anti-social behavior
			  • Negative peer influences
				We will collectively improve community indicators of success resulting in the following outcomes:
				Increase in...
				• Pre-school attendance
				• 3rd grade reading
				• 3rd grade math
				• High school completion
				• Higher education access and completion
				• Housing affordability
				• Youth connectedness
				• Health insurance coverage
				• Fruit and vegetable consumption
				• Physical activity
				• Dental visits
				Decrease in...
				• Child maltreatment
				• Youth binge drinking
				• Youth alcohol/drug use
				• Youth depression
				• Youth tobacco use
				• Teen births
				• Childhood obesity
				• Homelessness
				• Juvenile arrests
				• Adult arrests
				• Domestic violence
				• Gang membership
				• Poverty
				• Hip fractures
				• Unemployment