



UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

Portfolio Review Committee Agenda

May 15th, 2013 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
3600 Westwind Blvd., Santa Rosa, Orville Wright 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 from April meeting
- 1:10 Updates & Reports**
Update on portfolio activity since last meeting
Report out on appeal
- 1:35 Applications to the Portfolio ACTION ITEM**
Tier 2 Application: El Puente, LifeWorks of Sonoma County
Issue(s) for discussion: Evaluation
Tier 2 Application: Latino Service Providers, West County Community Services
Issue(s) for discussion: Literature review, Logic model, Evaluation
- 2:50 Tier 1 Fidelity ACTION ITEM**
Simplify the process for articulating fidelity
- 3:15 Public comment**
- 3:30 Adjourn**

Upcoming Meetings

May 15th, 2013
June 19th, 2013
July 17th, 2013
August 21st, 2013



Wednesday, April 17, 2013 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:30 a.m.

3600 Westwind Blvd.

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

Alfredo Perez, First 5 Sonoma County
 Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
 Dan Blake, SCOE
 Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way of the Wine Country
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
 Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office
 Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department (staff)

Marla Stuart, Human Services Department (project manager)
 Megan Sirna, Human Services Department (staff)
 Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department
 Robert Judd, Community Foundation
 Serena Lineau, City of Santa Rosa
 Steven Jackson, SCOE

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes	<p>Introductions.</p> <p>Motion to approve the minutes</p>	<p>Motion: Serena</p> <p>Second: BJ</p> <p>Yes:10</p> <p>No:0</p> <p>Abstain: 1 (Dan)</p>	None
Updates & Reports	<p>Update report with Portfolio activities since March meeting.</p> <p>Short update about some new positions in Upstream.</p> <p>Katie arrived.</p> <p>Update on new positions in Upstream</p> <p>Is there an issue with discussing applications when only one of the reviewers is present?</p> <p><u>Comments</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When one reviewer says something is missing, give us something to target the discussion. Need to get to where to look in a very large application. • It is important to be able to talk it out with the other reviewer. It is difficult for consistency. Since we meet once a month, it may be worth holding the discussion to the next meeting. <p><u>We won't make a decision, but here are some options</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It can be difficult 	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It works fine. • Get more information from the person. • Assign the review to another person. • If the reviewers know they are not able to be there, they decide if their review should be discussed. • Ask the applicant what they would prefer • Send any additional ideas to Larissa. 		
Applications	<p><u>Double Punches Boxing</u> Serena recused herself. Her organization is a funder of this program. Larissa read program description. Carol--Questions, literature review, methods and analysis are missing. BJ-- it is a light evaluation but it had most of the things. I saw questions, minimal analysis, raw data is there. Would like to see a more robust evaluation in the future. The methodology is not the best in the world. It is a lot of self- report which I don't put a lot of stock in. Manual was excellent. Carol—If our standard is most, then I think it is fine. Katie—if I am going to be reviewing an evaluation, I want to make sure that the analysis is rigorous enough. I think we need to talk about whether or not there is an impact on families based on the rigor of the evaluation. Carol--We had the same evaluation last time and it was not approved. Marla--We do need to discuss those issues but it is totally possible that we might approve the Measure O evaluation with some application and not others. BJ--The outcomes are really high. Even if this is self-report, that is still very positive. Even though it is perception, there is something positive happening there.</p> <p>Motion to approve Double Punches for tier 2.</p> <p><u>Street Outreach</u> Serena recused herself. Her organization is a funder of this program. Monique recused herself. Her organization is a funder of this program. Larissa read program description. Katie--The measures in the SR Choice Evaluation did not match to the stated objectives in the OJJDP evaluation and the literature review and the logic model. Arrests were not addressed in CHOICE. That leaves only the OJJDP evaluation. Does it match the local implementation? There were 5 cites and 3 of them did not implement the program. The ones that were implemented had problems around target population. There were too many questions to approve it. Is it sufficient to say that the local implementation is promising?</p>	<p>Motion: BJ Second: Leo Yes: 11 No: 0</p> <p>Motion: Rob Second: Robert Yes: 10 No: 0</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Marla-Susan was the other reviewer. She is not here and we were not able to speak to her about this application.</p> <p>It seems that they do not need to evaluate all outcomes.</p> <p>This is evaluation light is still in my mind.</p> <p>Why should we do this now if it is not going to be right?</p> <p>I need someone who has read the materials to have this discussion with me—an informed discussion. Susan might be able to assuage my issues.</p> <p>Motion to postpone a decision until next month.</p> <p><u>Family Therapy</u></p> <p>Rob recused himself. His organization is a funder of this program.</p> <p>Serena recused herself. Her organization is a funder of this program.</p> <p>Larissa read program description.</p> <p>Rob left.</p> <p>Julie-Is this Tier 1 or Tier 2? They are not yet licensed for FFT. Everything they submitted was related to FFT. They did not go through the process to get the licenses, etc. to use this program.</p> <p>Dan-I did not make that distinction. Can we approve their application given where they are in the process? I thought so.</p> <p>Marla--They are not eligible for Tier 1 because they have not done the required licensure process.</p> <p>Julie--They say that FFT is informing their practice. Everything has FFT.</p> <p>Katie--The copyright issue is not our issue.</p> <p>Motion to approve for Tier 2</p>	<p>Motion: Carol</p> <p>Second: BJ</p> <p>Yes: 9</p> <p>No: 1</p>	
<p>Discussion Items</p>	<p><u>Accreditation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should they tell us what the accrediting body requires? • External monitoring of program delivery • They passed. • It is recurring, frequency of the time frame • What were the requirements for accreditation? • The overarching purpose is that they are convincing us they have fidelity to the model. <p><u>Review Committee role in evaluating the quality of evaluation and evaluation plan</u></p> <p>Read the Tier 2 criteria for the evaluation.</p> <p>What are we going to require about rigor for Tier 2 evaluation?</p> <p>Leo: clear expected outcomes are something that exist in the logic model and literature review</p> <p>Katie: should be able to see the same outcomes in evaluation as logic model, lit review, and program design. Should be able to see the link in the logic model</p>		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>What if there are outcomes that they don't have an evaluation on? That comes up often. The Santa Rosa Choice evaluation was used for several different orgs and so the evaluation does not necessarily We want to be able to raise the rigor. Is self report good enough? Katie: it depends on what they are proposing to do. If it is around 40 assets, yes. If it is about behavior change, then they should have something else. Kirkpatrick's model of evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were you happy? (not alone) • What learning happened? (Quiz, test, observation, pre/post test) • What behavior changes have occurred? (Self-report, observation) • What are the results? -long term • ROI? <p>What level do we want? Do we require triangulation? No. They need to match. Are they measuring what they say they are achieving? Applicants needs to have an opportunity to weave these things together. Level best.</p>		
Public Comment	Maria Lopez, Gustavo Martinez and Ron Soto made public comment.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourn at 3:30pm.	None	None



UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

Update Report for the Portfolio Review Committee

May 15th, 2013

Total number of programs approved for tier placement on the Portfolio

Tier 1: 21 programs

Tier 2: 24 programs

Tier 3: 13 programs

Total: 58 programs

Number of agencies on the Portfolio: 70 agencies

Activity since April 17, 2013

	Review Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Status
1.	4.9.13	Family Therapy	Social Advocates for Youth	Tier 2
2.	4.9.13	Double Punches	Salvation Army	Tier 2
3.	4.19.13	MyLIFE Transition Program	VOICES / On the Move	Tier 3
4.	4.19.12	WHEEL Early Literacy Program	Community Action Partnership	Technical assistance
5.	4.23.13	Motivational Interviewing	Sunny Hills Services	Technical Assistance
6.	4.29.13	Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy	The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship	Tier 1
7.	4.30.13	El Puente	LifeWorks of Sonoma County	Discuss today
8.	5.2.13	Latino Service Providers	West County Community Services	Discuss today
9.	5.2.13	Roseland University Prep Knights Academy After School Program	Roseland Charter School	Tier 2
10.	5.9.13	Cooperative Parenting and Divorce	Petaluma People Services Center	Tier 2

Other active submissions to date

	Last Activity Date	Submission Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Status
11.	3.13.13	2.27.13	Tackling Tough Skills	Goodwill Redwood Empire	Awaiting info from applicant
12.	2.22.13	2.5.13	Head Start	Community Action Partnership	Awaiting info from applicant
13.	12.14.12	9.3.12	Health Kids Sonoma County	Redwood Community Health Coalition	Awaiting info from applicant
14.	9.31.12	9.24.12	HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Interfaith Shelter Network	Awaiting info from applicant
15.	9.25.12	6.29.12	Play Therapy	Petaluma People Services Center	Awaiting info from applicant
16.	7.13.12	6.20.11	The Toolbox Project	Dovetail Learning, Inc.	Awaiting info from applicant
17.	9.12.12	12.20.11	Recreation and Parks Afterschool Program	City of Santa Rosa	Awaiting info from applicant
18.	9.12.12	12.14.11	Recreation and Parks Neighborhood Services Sports Programs	City of Santa Rosa	Awaiting info from applicant



UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Application Form: TIER 1

Program Name _____

Organization _____

1. **Evidence-based Clearinghouse:** Which of the following clearinghouses includes this program as evidence-based? (Please insert the specific web address to the program on the clearinghouse.) If the reviewers cannot find the program on the clearinghouse this application will be returned to you.

- _____ [California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse](#)
- _____ [Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence](#)
- _____ [Child Trends LINKS](#)
- _____ [Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy](#)
- _____ [Cochrane Collaboration Library of Systematic Reviews](#)
- _____ [Diffusion of Effective Behavioral Interventions - DEBI](#)
- _____ [Guide to Community Preventive Services](#)
- _____ [Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention](#)
- _____ [SAMHSA's National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices](#)
- _____ [What Works Clearinghouse](#)
- _____ Other (please list)

2. **Accreditation**

a. Does the model program require a recurring accreditation, license, or review or audit process?

~~No (go to 2b)~~ Yes (please attach evidence and go to question 4)

b. Does the model program offer a voluntary recurring accreditation, license, or review or audit process?

~~No (go to question 3)~~ Yes (go to question 2c)

c. Do you participate?

~~No (go to question 3)~~ Yes (please attach evidence and go to question 4)

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", First line: 0", Don't adjust space between Latin and Asian text, Tab stops: Not at 0.75"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Tab stops: Not at 1" + 3" + 3.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", First line: 0"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Tab stops: Not at 1" + 3" + 3.5"

Formatted: None, Indent: Left: 0.25", Tab stops: Not at 1" + 3" + 3.5"

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0.25", Tab stops: Not at 1" + 3" + 3.5"

3.2 Fidelity*: How is the program implemented in Sonoma County with fidelity to the evaluated model?

	Required by model program	How you meet model program requirements
Adherence		
Dose/exposure		
Quality of program delivery		
Participant responsiveness		

*** You may participate in an ongoing, third party audit or accreditation process. If so, contact us before completing this form.**

For a full description of TIER 1, refer to the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs: INSTRUCTIONS
Submit this form to Info@SonomaUpstream.org - 707.565.5800 or mail to Upstream 3600 Westwind Blvd., Santa Rosa, CA 95402
Portfolio of Upstream Programs: **Application Form: TIER 1 (Revised 9.4.12)**

4.3. Adaptations

a. Have you adapted the program from the model program?

No

Yes ([go to question 3b](#))

b. In what ways have you adapted the program from the model program?

Comments: