



UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

Portfolio Review Committee Agenda

July 17, 2013 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
2550 Paulin Drive, Santa Rosa, Sequoia 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 June meeting

1:10 Updates & Reports

Update on portfolio activity since last meeting

-- Applications to the Portfolio ACTION ITEM

No Reviews

1:15 Discussion Items

Develop Logic Model

Develop Portfolio Renewals Process

Review DRAFT Record of Upstream Portfolio Changes

Review DRAFT Manual

3:15 Public comment

3:30 Adjourn

Parking Lot

Tier 2 Evaluations: Evaluating Quality

Upcoming Meetings

August 21st, 2013, 2550 Paulin Dr.

September 18th, 2013, 2550 Paulin Dr.

October 16th, 2013, 3600 Westwind Blvd

November 20th, 2013, 3600 Westwind Blvd

December 18th, 2013, 3600 Westwind Blvd



Wednesday, June 19, 2013 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

3600 Westwind Blvd., Orville Wright room

Members (listed alphabetically)

Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
 B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting
 Dan Blake, SCOE
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department
 Stephen Jackson, SCOE
 Robert Judd, Community Foundation
 Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa
 Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way
 Alfredo Perez, First 5 Sonoma County
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
 Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office

Staff (listed alphabetically)

Oscar Chavez, Human Services Department
 Marla Stuart, Human Services Department
 Annette Walker, Human Services Department

Public (listed alphabetically)

Jill Royce, LifeWorks
 Linda Walsh, LifeWorks

| Topic | Discussion | Decision | Next Steps |
|--|--|---|-------------------|
| Welcome, Introductions, Minutes | <p>Introductions.</p> <p>Corrections: Serena's name spelled wrong; should be Lienau. Page 3, Debrief section, first bullet, should state . . . <i>ladder</i> for Tier 3, not <i>latter</i>.</p> <p>Motion to approve the minutes, with corrections.</p> | <p>Motion: Dan Second: Katie Yes: 13 No: 0</p> | None |
| Updates & Reports | <p>Update on Portfolio activities since last meeting.</p> <p>Larissa has been promoted to probation. Her replacement has been hired and will start July 9, 2013.</p> | None | None |
| Applications | <p><u>Tier 2 Application: El Puente, LifeWorks of Sonoma County</u></p> <p><u>Issue(s) for discussion: Evaluation</u></p> <p>Serena Lienau recused herself as she is a funder of El Puente.</p> <p>Marla read the program description.</p> <p>The two reviewers are Leo Tacata and Jennifer O'Donnell.</p> | <p>Motion: Carol Second: Katie Yes: 11 No: 1 Abstain: 1 Denied</p> | |

| Topic | Discussion | Decision | Next Steps |
|-------|---|----------|------------|
| | <p>Committee Discussion: The following components met criteria and were complimented by the reviewers: literature review, logic model, manual and cohorts.</p> <p>B.J. Bischoff discussed the commendable components of El Puente’s program. As a Tier 2 application which is required to “suggest positive outcomes, El Puente has supported the outcomes they claimed in their logic model. They are not being held to the rigor of a Tier 1 evaluation. El Puente suggests that youth behavioral problems decreased with improved family interactions by reporting that more youth felt more safe at home and had increased connections with adults. They also reported that 68% of the program youth reported improved relationships with their family members. Evaluation reports also reflected a reduction in impulsive behavior through decreased verbal conflicts, unhealthy friendships and gang relationships.</p> <p>The reviewers praised El Puente for creating a manual specific to our criteria.</p> <p>Other reviewers commented that outcomes measured in the evaluation do not match the outcomes in the literature review, logic model or program description. While there are likely measure tools for Brief Focused Strategic Therapy, they were not used by El Puente. Their evaluations only included changes reported by Youth. Furthermore, the only measure of improved conflict resolution within the family was youth reports. The committee felt these lacked objectivity and reports from family members would have improved El Puente’s evaluation. Self reporting about specific behaviors can be valid; however in this case they lacked specificity and triangulation. Validated self reporting tools are available, however they were not used. There were no measures of substance abuse or school attendance. It appeared that staff and parent surveys had been used; however they were not present in the portfolio application. Additionally, the committee noted that when dealing with family function it is critical to examine not only youth behavior, but also parent behavior.</p> <p>In summary, while El Puente’s measures suggest positive results they were not direct enough.</p> <p>Public Comment: Linda Walsh from LifeWorks gave a three minute comment discussing El Puente’s evaluation and outcomes</p> <p>Motion to deny.</p> | | |

| Topic | Discussion | Decision | Next Steps |
|------------------|---|----------|------------|
| Discussion Items | <p>Three Reviewers: The intent of today’s discussion is to discuss the overall Portfolio process and identify areas for improvement. Our goal is to be fair and defensible throughout the review process. Three reviewers per evaluation would shorten meetings, while minimizing discussion of difficult content in front of organizations. Additionally, if reviewers disagreed and one reviewer was unable to make it to the meeting, a decision would not have to be postponed.</p> <p>Alternately, is great value in transparency through open discussion in front of organizations. Allowing organizations to see our process will give them a better understanding of our requirements, areas where they excelled and areas where they need to improve. While it often involves difficult conversations, convening as a committee is still worth our time. Adding a third reviewer would increase everyone’s workload. A two reviewer system has been working fine and we can’t justify adding a third reviewer to every application.</p> <p>To prevent postponed decisions when one reviewer is absent, we could ask all reviewers to confirm that they can attend the committee meeting where the program will be discussed when they receive the application. It may also be helpful to have two primary reviewers and one back-up.</p> <p>Technical Assistance Technical Assistance is critical to all organizations applying for portfolio. We need to consistently evaluate and improve our technical assistance. The following questions were raised and discussed:</p> <p>Is our Technical Assistance working? Could we have a consistent report of how many clients have received/are receiving Technical Assistance? Could we improve our Technical Assistance by implementing a Technical Assistance Checklist? Could we provide additional instructions and better define our expected outcomes? Are our outcomes realistic? For example, “eliminating substance abuse by teens” is an unrealistic outcome.</p> <p>The logic model should drive the evaluation. Are we offering adequate Technical Assistance to enable clients to do this? Do we need to include additional tools and instructions on the logic model? The Technical Assistance workshops offered in the past were praised and it was suggested that in the future Tier specific workshops be offered. It could also be beneficial to survey clients that have received Technical Assistance regarding their experience.</p> <p>It would also be helpful to know which clients had received what Technical Assistance before</p> | | |

| Topic | Discussion | Decision | Next Steps |
|-------|--|----------|------------|
| | <p>making a decision.</p> <p>Tier 2 Expectations for Evaluation</p> <p>It is necessary to establish what evaluations will be acceptable for Tier 2 evaluations and Tier 3 plans. As we review applications we need to be realistic regarding the data actually available to the organizations. For example, if an out of school program claims that involvement in their program will improve school performance, is it realistic for us to expect them to show improved academic performance since they don't have easy access to students' academic records?. It was suggested that if they are making the claim that they can improve academic performance then the onus is on them to get the records.</p> <p>Should triangulation be a requirement for Tier 2 approval? Validity can be a gray issue, what is our measure for determining if there is significant triangulation? Self-reporting should exist in relationship with validity and triangulation. It is critical that outcomes which are clearly observable behavior change will require greater authentication than self report. For example, alcohol dependency could not self-evaluate. The use of self-reporting depends largely on the program and their outcomes. If the outcome is, for instance personal efficacy, then pre and post reports are a valid form of measurement.</p> <p>Outcomes and evaluation need to convince us that they are actually achieving the outcomes they claim. The outcomes need to show consistent progress and fundamental behavior change. However, there may not always be evidence for long term outcomes at which point we would feel comfortable with intermediary measures. If the research claims that youth engagement with adults will improve grades, we would feel comfortable measuring engagement with adults. Pre and post self-reports can be considered validated instruments, however the degree to which they can be effectively used will vary for each organization. If we are not going to allow self-evaluation, the organization needs to know before they submit their application.</p> <p>We also need to keep in mind that many organizations only have self-report. Funds and other factors may limit their access to validated tools. While we are not able to offer a list of specific validated tools to Tier 2 applicants we could point them to Social Solution performance sites. However, many of the tools listed there could be too costly for our organizations.</p> <p>Ultimately, we don't need to make a decision to eliminate or accept self-report; it depends on how effectively the organization can use self-evaluation to show a link between their stated purpose and their evaluation.</p> <p>CHOICE evaluations are used by some of our clients. Our decision about the acceptability of the CHOICE evaluation is dependent on the applicants understanding of their results.</p> | | |

| Topic | Discussion | Decision | Next Steps |
|----------------------------|--|----------|------------|
| | <p>Relationship and Purpose What is our purpose related to capacity building and how can we show respect to organizations? Could we give the organization more time to discuss and present their program here? Decisions should be made based on portfolio applications not on discussion with the organization at the committee meeting. Discussion on our role also needs to include an evaluation of if it's our job to offer technical assistance and training or only to make an objective decision. If our intent is to educate organizations, not allowing discussion would miss a critical opportunity to educate and strengthen the local field.</p> <p>Additionally, it was noted that in listening to a critique of their program, without the ability to discuss it, clients may feel rejected when they leave. We need to be mindful of the language we use so that clients know our goal is to help them improve the quality of their programs. In the future the vote will be framed as "ready" or "not ready" instead of "approved" or "denied".</p> <p>Could we improve the way we wrap-up the discussion with organizations? It could be beneficial to offer them parting words that would encourage and offer suggestions for improvement.</p> <p>We require rigorous standards, however it is critical that we are realistic and maintain a balance between our community's readiness for evidence-informed practice and our expectations for rigor.</p> <p>Delivery of Applications to Reviewer It was very helpful to be told exactly what issues to look at before discussion. Since standards are evolving, it's helpful to receive the instructions that the program received when they began their evaluation.</p> <p>Manual The manual is a critical part of a portfolio. How do we know if an organization is using the manual or if they only created it for portfolio application? It should be evident from their outcomes and evaluation if the manual is in use.</p> | | |
| <p>Next Meeting</p> | <p>The location of the next three meetings has been changed to 2550 Paulin Drive, Santa Rosa, Sequoia Room. INSTRUCTION FOR ENTERING THE BUILDING: This building is the Human Services Department public assistance intake office and access to the meeting room is employee only. There is an employee entrance on the <u>north</u> side. You can park there. If you arrive a bit before 1:00, there will be someone to meet you and bring you in. If no one is at the</p> | | |

| Topic | Discussion | Decision | Next Steps |
|----------------|--|----------|------------|
| | door, please go to the <u>west</u> client entrance and introduce yourself to the receptionist. They will have a list of committee members and will let you in. | | |
| Adjourn | Adjourned at 3:30 pm. | None | None |



UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

Update Report for the Portfolio Review Committee July 17, 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

Activity related to active submissions since June 19, 2013

| | Submission Date | Program | Submitting Agency | Last Activity Date | Status |
|---|-----------------|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|
| 1 | 6/28/13 | Triple P Parenting | YWCA | 7/11/13 | Technical assistance |
| 2 | 6/19/13 | MAYi | MAYi | 6/25/13 | Technical assistance |
| 3 | 6/7/13 | Triple P Parenting | Russian River Counselors | 7/11/13 | Technical assistance |
| 4 | 5/17/13 | Tackling Tough Skills | Goodwill Redwood Empire | 7/11/13 | Sent to reviewers |
| 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 | 7/3/13 |
| 2 | TBD | CPI | 6/24/13 |
| 3 | TBD | Volunteer Center | 6/24/13 |

Other active submissions with no activity since June 19, 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 |



Record of Upstream Portfolio Changes

DRAFT July 12, 2013

Introduction

With the intent of further standardizing the thinking and decisions of the Portfolio Review Committee, and to promote replicability of the Portfolio, a record of the following significant issues is memorialized here

General

| | | |
|----|-----------------------|---|
| 1. | Process Changes | 3 |
|----|-----------------------|---|

General Application Process

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Web-Based Application | 3 |
| 2. | Version Control..... | 3 |
| 3. | Waiting period Between Applications | 3 |
| 4. | Portfolio Placement Renewal | 3 |
| 5. | Tier Priority | 3 |
| 6. | Portfolio Publication | 3 |

Individual Review Process

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Application Delivery to Reviewers | 4 |
| 2. | Reviewer Conflict of Interest..... | 4 |
| 3. | Reviewer Questions | 4 |
| 4. | Reviewer Consistency (inter-rater reliability)..... | 5 |

Committee Review Process

| | | |
|----|---|---|
| 1. | Portfolio Review Committee Governance..... | 5 |
| 2. | Meeting Management..... | 5 |
| 3. | Committee Discussions when a Reviewer is Absent..... | 5 |
| 4. | Interaction with Applications at Committee Meetings | 6 |
| 5. | Committee Decision for Tier Placement | 6 |

Tier 1

| | | |
|----|--------------------------|---|
| 1. | Clearinghouses | 6 |
| | • Sustained Effect | 6 |
| 2. | Fidelity | 7 |
| | • Accreditation..... | 7 |
| 3. | Cost Benefit..... | 8 |

Tier 2 and Tier 3

| | | |
|-----|--|----|
| 4. | Literature Review | 8 |
| 5. | Logic Model | 9 |
| 6. | Manual..... | 9 |
| | • Fidelity to Manual | 9 |
| | • Site Visits | 9 |
| 7. | Tier 2 Evaluation | 9 |
| | • CHOICES Evaluation | 11 |
| | • Adequacy of Submitted Research..... | 11 |
| | • Fidelity to External Evaluations for Tier 2..... | 11 |
| 8. | Tier 3 Evaluation Plan | 11 |
| 9. | Cohorts..... | 12 |
| 10. | Tier 2 and 3 with Clearinghouse | 12 |

Process Changes

- Process questions and discussion are good. However, they should not be addressed in reference to an individual review. Individual reviews should be completed using the processes in place at the time of the application. (May 16, 2012)
- Reviewers will note a process question or requested change on a form and submit to HSD staff. HSD staff will agendize the discussion for a future meeting after the current review is completed. (May 16, 2012)

General Application Process

Web-Based Applications

- In February 2011 Workgroup 1 (described in section Ia. above) tested a web-based Portfolio Application process developed by staff of the Human Services Department. **ADD RESULT**

Version Control

- It is important that everyone is consulting the same version of a document when a decision is being made. HSD staff will send a link to the version used for an application so the reviewers can consult the same version that the applicant did. (June 20, 2012)

Waiting period between applications

- When a program is denied Tier placement (both rounds of review), should there be a required waiting period before the program can reapply? Discussion but no decision. (October 17, 2012)

Portfolio Placement Renewal

DEVELOP

Tier Priority

- At the June 2011 meeting, the Upstream Ad Hoc Committee confirmed that the Tiers do not imply a value judgment. Tier 1 is not considered more strongly for funding than Tier 3. There was a consensus that programs that have achieved Tier placement have exhibited a commitment to evidence-informed, prevention-focused services. (June 2011)

Portfolio Publication

- Workgroup 1 (described in section Ia. above) intended to maintain an online, searchable index of Portfolio programs that included the following:

1. Program name
2. Evidence-Based Tier
3. Organization name
4. Contact name and information (phone, e-mail, address)
5. Program website (if applicable)
6. Program Description

7. Prevention-focused category(s)
8. Upstream factor(s) addressed
9. Geographic location of services
10. Target audience: annual number and type of clients served
11. Annual program or strategy budget
12. Funding source(s)
13. Average program or strategy cost per client
14. Effect size (if available)
15. Overall cost benefit (if available)
16. Cost benefit to Sonoma County (if available)

The Human Services Department has not had the capacity to implement this goal. To date, www.SonomaUpstream.org only includes an alphabetical (non-searchable) list of approved Portfolio programs with their implementing organization and their funder.

Individual Review Process

Application Delivery to Reviewers

- Large applications should not be e-mailed. They can be difficult for Reviewers to access. HSD staff will post them somewhere that the reviewer can retrieve them. (June 20, 2012)
- HSD staff will submit each section of the application to the reviewers as a separate document (usually PDF) and labeled as such. (June 20, 2012)
- HSD staff will ensure that applicants more clearly label the sections of a manual. (August 15, 2012)

Reviewer Conflict of Interest

- Because Sonoma County is relatively small and it is highly likely that several reviewers may be familiar with or previously involved with individual applications, it may be difficult to require that reviewers that have knowledge of or a prior Reviewers will make every effort to avoid the appearance of a conflict of interest. (April 18, 2012)
- Any time a reviewer feels they cannot be objective or that applicants may not be comfortable with the reviewer, the reviewer will recuse themselves. (April 18, 2012)
- Reviewers will approach their work with a mindset of integrity. (April 18, 2012)
- One role of having two blind reviewers is to avoid reviewer bias. (April 18, 2012)
- Reviewers are not required to recuse themselves from reviewing a program they currently or have previously funded. (May 16, 2012).
- The reason for a recusal will be documented in the minutes. (May 16, 2012)
- Per County Counsel, it is not necessary for Reviewers to leave the room when they recuse themselves. (July 20, 2012)

Reviewer Questions

- If reviewers have concerns or a lack of clarity about an existing process that prevents them from making a Tier placement decision, the reviewer should talk to HSD staff. (May 16, 2012)

- When a reviewer is not clear on any part of the application, then the application should not be approved. (August 15, 2012)
- Sometimes the statistical analysis of an evaluation may be very complex. Not all reviewers have the background to understand complex statistical analysis. It is not necessary that the reviewers understand the details of the analysis, only that they understand the summary of the results and feel comfortable that positive outcomes are suggested. (August 15, 2012)

Reviewer Consistency (inter-rater reliability)

- To promote standardization between Reviewers, there will be an opportunity for Reviewers to debrief any review completed in the prior month during the monthly report of completed applications. (July 20, 2012)
- Committee members discussed the possibility of additional training to standardize reviewer thinking and decisions. No decision. (September 19, 2012)

Committee Review Process

Portfolio Review Committee Governance

- Workgroup 1 decided that the Portfolio Review Committee did not need officers. The scope of the Committee is very clear and relatively narrow. The agenda is very standardized. Facilitation by the Human Services Department staff is sufficient. (August 16, 2011).

Meeting Management

- Meetings are long. HSD staff will make a commitment to move meetings along as quickly as possible. (September 19, 2012)
- The Committee agreed to standardize the format for discussing applications as follows. (September 19, 2012)
 - HSD staff announce the program name, submitting agency, and reviewers.
 - HSD staff provide a synopsis of the program.
 - HSD staff ask for recusals.
 - Denying reviewer discusses their thinking.
 - Approving reviewer discussed their thinking
 - Response and dialogue.
- Our deliberations are long and repetitive. Maybe we need a more facilitated discussion. (May 15, 2013)
- Add changes introduced at June 2013 meeting

Committee discussions when a reviewer is absent

- When either of the reviewers is not present or no longer on the committee, a vote will be taken. (May 16, 2012)
- Is there any issues with discussing applications when one reviewers is absent? Some reviewers feel the process is fine. Others feel it is difficult to have a back-and-forth conversation and to understand the thinking of a reviewer who is absent. "I need someone who has read the materials to

have an informed discussion with me. Another person may be able to assuage my issues.” Can we postpone the discussion to the next month? Can we get more information from the absent reviewer? Can we assign the review to another person? Can we ask the applicant if they prefer to have the Committee discuss or wait? No decision. (April 17, 2013)

Interaction with Applicants at Committee Meetings

- The May 2011 agenda of Workgroup 1 included the following item: Invite submitters to WG1 review to answer questions?
- **ADD JUNE 2013 DISCUSSION**

Committee Decision for Tier Placement

- Originally, Workgroup 1 reviewed each application to the Portfolio and made consensus recommendations about Tier placement to the Upstream Ad Hoc Committee which voted on the recommendations. At the June 2011 Ad Hoc meeting, Marla Stuart reported, on behalf of Workgroup 1, that consensus about Tier placement is not always possible. The Workgroup proposed they first attempt to receive consensus, and if consensus is not achieved then a majority vote determines Tier placement decisions. The Ad Hoc Committee approved this recommendation. (June 2011)
- Applications that come to Committee for discussion are usually denied (to date 14 applications have come to committee and 11 have been denied). Is it possible that our process is biased against approvals at committee? Perhaps there is pressure for the approving reviewer to concede to the other? Two changes will be tried. First, the reason for denial will be included in the agenda so the approving reviewer can prepare his/her thinking and the applicant can also be prepared to address that component of their application during public comment. Second, instead of voting only when there is not consensus between reviewers, all applications that come to committee will be decided by vote. This may free the reviewers from feeling they have to agree with each other. (October 17, 2012)
- Voted to approve new procedures described above. (January 16, 2013)

Tier 1

Clearinghouses

- Originally, Tier 1 applicants listed the clearinghouse on which their program was listed. An e-mail from Marla Stuart to Workgroup 1 on May 4, 2011 included the following: “For all programs submitted to Tier 1, please do see if you can find the program on the identified clearinghouse. In at least one case so far, the 2 reviewers couldn’t find the program and neither can I.” **DATE CHANGED**

Sustained Effect

- **WHY WE USE CLEARINIHOUSES** At the June 2011 Upstream Ad Hoc Committee meeting, Workgroup 1 recommended, and the Ad Hoc Committee decided, to remove sustained effect as a clearinghouse criteria for Tier 1. Marla Stuart presented the Workgroup 1 thinking as follows. Sustained effect is very important to Upstream Investments – in fact fundamental to our belief that

upstream investments have long-lasting impacts and cost savings. However, several of the important and well-regarded clearinghouses do not require evidence of sustained effect as part of their criteria for being evidence-based (SAMHSA NREPP, What Works Clearinghouse, OJJDP Model Programs Guide)). Since there is not a clear consensus among evidence-based clearinghouses about the need to include evidence of sustained effect as a requirement for being evidence-based, it is premature for the Portfolio to require it. The Portfolio Review Committee will revisit this decision when sustained effect as a requirement for being evidence-based becomes more standard in the field. (June 2011)

Fidelity

- The agenda for the August 2011 meeting of Workgroup 1 included a study and discussion of fidelity criteria. A review of clearinghouse requirements was prepared for discussion and is included as an appendix in the Portfolio Manual. (August 16, 2011)
- Initially, the Portfolio fidelity requirement included the following dimensions:
 - Selection: the criteria used to include/exclude clients
 - Participation: the level of client engagement
 - Staff: the qualifications, roles, behaviors, and activities of staff
 - Exposure: the duration and intensity of services
 - Content: the procedures and activities of the services

These dimensions mirrored the dimensions used by First 5 Sonoma County. In November 2011, First 5 Sonoma County changed their fidelity requirements to include the following dimensions:

- Adherence: the extent to which the model's critical elements (core activities and methods necessary to achieve te outcomes desired) are implemented
- Dose/Exposure: the amount of program content received by participants
- Quality of Program elivery: the manner in which providers implement the program
- Participant responsiveness: the extent to which participants are engaged by and involved in the activities and content of the program

The Upstream Ad Hoc Committee Workgroup 1 highly valued alignment with other initiatives and the leadership of First 5 Sonoma County related to the local implementation of evidence-based practices. At the February 7, 2012 meeting of Workgroup, the group asked Human Services Department staff to learn more about the new First 5 dimensions. Workgroup 1 changed the Portfolio fidelity criteria to mirror First 5 Sonoma County. (DATE)

- Committee requested clarification about the components of fidelity. (July 20, 2012)
- LOTS TO ADD HERE STILL

Accreditation

- The current Tier 1 criteria are silent on whether or not outside fidelity monitoring is required when the program developer does not require it but provides optional fidelity monitoring. Concerns about the cost of this fidelity were expressed. Concerns about programs self-evaluating were also expressed. Reviewers agreed that 1) if the model program requires accreditation, we will too, and 2) if the model program offers voluntary accreditation or does not offer accreditation, applications are not required to participate in accreditation but them must demonstrate fidelity to the model. (July 20, 2012)

- If accreditation is required by a model program, we require that the local implementer participates in the accreditation. If the local program reports that accreditation is not required, they need to provide evidence that it is not required (because sometimes an applicant reports that no accreditation is required but a reviewer finds evidence of require accreditation). (September 19, 2012 and confirmed again October 17, 2012)
- Some applicants submit a training certificate as evidence of accreditation. This does not seem adequate and Reviewers feel the need to research the accreditation requirements. The applicant should submit evidence of what is required for accreditation as well as evidence that the requirement has been met. If a model program only requires training for accreditation, then we will accept it. But if it is not clear what is required, the Reviewer should deny the application and HSD staff will provide technical assistance. (January 16, 2013)
- Staff presented a white paper discussion of accreditation (see Appendix X). What do we want related to accreditation? We did a brainstorm – external monitoring, evidence of passing, recurring, frequent, list of the requirements. The overarching purpose of us accepting an outside accreditation is to convince us that they have fidelity to the original model. The draft definition of accreditation proposed by staff was not accepted. (April 17, 2013)
- Staff reported that 93% of evidence-based programs have no articulated fidelity measures (Larissa heard this at a conference) and to date we have not had any program submit acceptable evidence of external accreditation. Staff recommends that we remove the option for accreditation as evidence of fidelity and require all Tier 1 applicants to complete the fidelity matrix. A footnote will instruct programs to talk to HSD staff if they feel they have an accreditation that provides evidence of their fidelity. The Committee noted that the statistica bout the lack of fidelity measures and accreditation processes is an affirmation of why we have struggled with this. The Committee voted to limit proof of fidelity to the fidelity matrix (with any exceptions discussed with staff prior to delivery to Reviewer). (May 15, 2013)

Cost Benefit

- Originally, Tier 1 requested information about the cost benefit of the local implementation of an evidence-based program. This wwas not required, but was listed as a “Bonus.” **CHANGED DATE**

Tier 2 and Tier 3

Literature Review

- **AGE OF LIT REVIEW**
- The required components for a credible literature review originally included the following, “It should be clear that the most influential, most current, and most cited sources have been included.” Workgroup 1 decided this requirement is too rigorous and rarely met by applicants. This requirement was removed. (July 25, 2011)
- What is known and unknown about a topic is not always explicit in the literature review. It is important that the Reviewer is convinced that the program understands the body of knowledge in the field. (December 19, 2012)

Logic Model

- The original Portfolio required some or all of the following elements in a logic model:
 - Vision
 - Population Served
 - Population Needs
 - Services delivered
 - Resources
 - Assumptions
 - Outcomes (Process, Output and Client)
 - Indicators of success
 - Measurement Tools
- **DATE CHANGED**
- Assumptions are not always causal; they can be general thoughts that influence what the program believes. They may not be explicitly stated but may be clearly implied through the sequence of the logic model. (December 19, 2012)

Manual

- The original Portfolio provided the following instructions for Manual: “The program has a book, manual, or other available writings that specify the components of the program and describe how to administer it. A program that has been standardized in this way can be reliably replicated elsewhere.” **CHANGED**
- The full manual is not provided to Reviewers because they are often very long, a large electronic document, or not available electronically. However, Reviewers find it difficult to feel confident that the manual is adequate by reviewing the table of contents alone. Some reviewers feel that a table of contents with page numbers or clear locations of a section are more reliable. Some reviewers judge the number of pages in a section to determine if is adequate. Reviewers can and should ask for the full manual if they have any questions about the manual. (December 19, 2012)
- How do we know that a program is following their manual with fidelity? Should we ask if they have made any adaptations from their manual? (December 19, 2012)

Fidelity to Manual

- The Committee discussed whether or not applications should be required to prove fidelity to their manual and decided they should not. (July 20, 2012)

Site Visits

- The Committee discussed whether or not site visits should be part of an application review. The Committee agreed that the Portfolio does not need as much information about a program as a funder might and therefore site visits are not needed. (August 15, 2012)

Tier 2 Evaluation

- The original Portfolio required the following components for a credible evaluation:
 - PURPOSE: Reason(s) that the evaluation was conducted.
 - AUDIENCE: Intended audience and their information or decision-making needs.
 - QUESTIONS: Questions that the evaluation answered.

- LITERATURE REVIEW: A review of the literature that informed the development of the program and the evaluation.
- METHODS: Data collection methods (for example, surveys, interviews, document review, observation, focus groups) with an explanation of confidentiality, anonymity, consent, objectivity, sampling, pilot testing, and reliability/validity.
- ANALYSIS: Appropriate descriptive and inferential analysis.
- RECOMMENDATIONS: Discussion of the analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.
- Workgroup 1 recognized that the components required for a credible Tier 2 evaluation did not explicitly include a discussion of the evaluation results. The group added RESULTS as a criteria. (July 25, 2011)
- For Tier 2, the original Portfolio required a locally conducted evaluation. An e-mail from Marla Stuart to Workgroup 1 on May 4, 2011 included the following: Program submitted for Tier 2 need to have each of the required components but they may not have been locally completed. For instance, Family Justice Center (FJC) has a lit review, logic model, evaluation, and has been replicated in many places – but none of the evaluations have been locally completed. FJC is standardized model implemented in more than 30 locations and all the sites are members of an organizing body. I think we'll see many programs like this. I think it reflects that there are many programs out there with solid evaluations but the programs are not yet peer reviewed and have not yet been reviewed by a clearinghouse. AT this point, I'm suggesting that we consider these programs Tier 2. However, at our next meeting we'll need to discuss whether or not we then need evidence of local fidelity to these model programs. And/or we can continue our discussion about whether these programs should be Tier 1 (and instead of using a clearinghouse as the criteria, we make a determination about each individual evidence criteria ...)" **DATE CHANGED**
- The agenda for the May 2011 Workgroup 1 meeting included: Do Tier 2 submissions that use evaluation from other communities require fidelity to the model? **DATE CHANGED**
- What are we going to require for rigor related to Tier 2 evaluations? Clear expected outcomes measurement that reflect the literature review and the logic model. We should be able to see the same outcomes in the literature review, the logic model, the program design, and the evaluation. What if they claim outcomes that they don't measure? Is self-report measurement adequate? It depends. It's probably adequate for measuring opinions but not for measuring change in knowledge or change in behavior. If self report is used, should we require triangulation with other methods? Can we use Kirpatrick's model of evaluation as our standard for rigor? Basically, we want to see that they are measuring what they believe they are achieving. No consensus. (April 17, 2013)
- Continued discussion about the Tier 2 evaluation. The Tier 3 evaluation plan should be a plan for an evaluation that we will accept for Tier 2. What do we accept? Maybe we should give the program a longer public comment. I don't feel good that we are not coming to consensus on the evaluation criteria. Our differing experience and opinions are helpful. Applicants put a lot of work into their application – without Upstream they may not be focused on evaluation at all. If we are all going to discuss the evaluation, we need to have all read it – but 3 days is not enough time/3 days if fine since that's what we have for the original review. Should we have 3 reviewers and a 2/3 decision? This needs to be a safe place to disagree. Is creating awareness about evaluation enough for Tier 2? Or do we have some level of rigor that we require? Walking into this, I would have thought it would be more rigorous. When we approve evaluations that do not meet a level of rigor, we miss an

opportunity to improve evaluation in the community. Programs won't improve their weak evaluations if we approve them. No consensus. (May 15, 2013)

- **ADD JUNE 2013 DISCUSSION**

CHOICES Evaluation

- This is the external evaluation funded by the Mayor's Gang Prevention Task Force to evaluate all their grantees. The rigor of the evaluation as it relates to individual programs has been questioned in relation to individual application. Reviewers will assess the acceptability in relation to each application and the extent to which the program understands and uses the evaluation. (June 19, 2013)

Adequacy of Submitted Research

- If a reviewer is not satisfied with the research submitted by the applicant, the reviewers should not search for additional research. It is the responsibility of the applicant to be knowledgeable of the body of knowledge, incorporate the research into program design, and submit the appropriate research as part of their Portfolio application. If an application is denied Tier placement due to inadequate research, HSD staff will provide technical assistance to the applicant. (April 18, 2012)

Fidelity to External Evaluations

- Tier 2 applicants submit an evaluation for their program but are not required to demonstrate fidelity to the evaluated model. Some members expressed a desire to require fidelity to any evaluation. The Committee decided (by vote) that applicants submitting an outside evaluation (not conducted by the local implementing agency) must demonstrate fidelity to the evaluated model. (July 20, 2012)
- HSD staff raised the following concerns about the July 20, 2012 committee vote. Requiring fidelity to external evaluations would make Tier 2 applicants significantly more difficult to complete – more difficult than Tier 1 applications. This may necessitate the need for a legacy program whereby programs approved before this time are described as having achieved a lower standard than programs approved after this decision. Staff suggested that instead of requiring full fidelity (as required by Tier 1) for Tier 2 applications with an external evaluation, reviewers answer two questions: 1) does the evaluation suggest positive outcomes? And 2) is the program consistent with the program evaluated? (August 15, 2012)
- It is not always clear that external evaluations are reflected in the local program design. Nor is it always clear that the results of local evaluations have been used to improve program design. Committee decided to add a question to the Scoring Sheet about whether or not the program design reflects the external or local evaluation results. (December 19, 2012)

Tier 3 Evaluation Plan

- The original Portfolio required the following for a credible evaluation plan.

Planning

- PURPOSE: Reason(s) that the evaluation is being conducted.
- AUDIENCE: Intended audience and their information or decision-making needs.

- QUESTIONS: Questions that the evaluation will answer.
- RESOURCES: Resources needed and available for the evaluation.
- CHALLENGES: Anticipated challenges to completing the evaluation and how they will be managed.
- LITERATURE REVIEW: A review of the literature that will inform the evaluation decision.

Implementation

- METHODS: Planned data collection methods (for example, surveys, interviews, document review, observation, focus groups) with attention to confidentiality, anonymity, consent, objectivity, sampling, pilot testing, reliability/validity, and timelines.
- ANALYSIS: Plan to analyze the collected information using appropriate descriptive and inferential approaches.
- INTERPRETATION: Identification of who will interpret the results and develop practice implications and recommendations.

Reporting

- REPORT: Expected contents and format of the report and a plan to produce the report.
- DISSEMINATION: Plan that identifies when and how to disseminate the report and to what audiences.
- USE: Plan to implement evaluation recommendations.

- **ADD DISCUSSION ABOUT PLAN RIGOR AND PATHWAY TO TIER 2 EVALUATION**

Cohorts

- Evidence of more than one cohort means that a program has been implemented, by any agency, at least once before. It does not require that the submitting agency has implemented the program with more than one cohort. Nor does the prior cohort have to have been local. (June 20, 2012)

Tier 2 and 3 with Clearinghouse

- Originally, programs could apply for Tier 2 or Tier 3 with a clearinghouse – because some national clearinghouses had categories similar to the Portfolio Tier 2 and 3 criteria. However, this was very confusing to applicants and it is actually rare for Clearinghouses to have criteria to Upstream Tier 2 and 3. The Committee decided not to allow Tier 2 and 3 applications with clearinghouse. (September 19, 2012)



Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs: MANUAL

DRAFT July 12, 2013

I. Description of Portfolio and Portfolio Review Committee

- a. History and Rationale
- b. Literature Review.....
- c. Definitions.....
- d. Purpose of the Portfolio
- e. Benefits of the Portfolio.....
- f. Assumptions inherent in the Portfolio.....

II. Portfolio Logic Model

III. Portfolio Governance

- a. BOS.....
- b. Review Committee
- c. Human Services Department.....
- d. Policy Committee and Executive Committee.....
- e. Appeal Committee
- f. County Counsel.....

IV. Users of the Portfolio

- a. Service Providers
- b. Local Funders.....
- c. Outreach to Users.....

V. Portfolio Implementation Practices

- a. Technical Assistance
- b. Application Submission
- c. Application Processing.....
- d. Application Review
- e. Reviewer Consistency / Inter-Rater Reliability
- f. Reviewer Decision
- g. Appeal Process.....
- h. Communication with Applicant

- i. Timing
- j. Meeting notifications

VI. Complying with Brown Act and Maddy Act

DEVELOP

VII. Record Keeping

DEVELOP

VIII. Evaluation

DEVELOP

IX. Attachments

- a. Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Review Committee Bylaws
- b. Portfolio Application and Review Process
- c. Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Application Review, Decision and Appeal Process Graphic
- d. Portfolio Instructions
- e. Application Forms
- f. Record of Upstream Portfolio Changes
- g. TA tools – logic model handout, PowerPoint, etc.
- h. References/Bibliography
- i. Workgroup 1: Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs: Summary of Review Process and Criteria Used by Clearinghouse Agencies (April 26, 2011)
- j. Fidelity Study Document, August 16, 2011

I. Description of Portfolio and Portfolio Review Committee

a. History and Rationale

The 2007 Sonoma County Strategic Plan found that criminal justice costs comprise over half of the discretionary general fund and, as a percent of the total discretionary general fund, are growing. As criminal justice costs continue to rise, County funds available for other County services are diminished. To explore whether or not there are alternatives to increasing criminal justice costs, the Board of Supervisors chartered the Upstream Investments Project.

On November 4, 2008, the Human Services Department convened the first meeting of the Upstream Steering Committee with four members representing the County Administrator's Office, Probation, Department of Health Services, and Human Services Department. Today (July 2013) the work continues through the Upstream Investments Policy Committee, a Board appointed policy committee with 30 members representing the Board of Supervisors, 14 County Departments, and 14 public and private partners. Over the years, the work has focused on XX areas: prevention-focused strategies, evidence-based practice, shared measurement, and collective impact.

This history focuses solely on the development of the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs. For more information about Upstream Investments, visit www.SonomaUpstream.org or contact 707.565.5800.

Upstream Team (November 2008 through January 2010)

In January 2010, the Upstream Team presented a report to the Board of Supervisors that identified a community consensus about the factors that contribute to criminal behavior, a discussion of effective and cost beneficial upstream interventions, and findings and recommendations for next steps in four areas.

1. Evidence-based Practice
2. Partnerships and Collaboration
3. Investing in Upstream Interventions
4. Ad Hoc Upstream Committee

Related to evidence-based practice, the report included two findings:

Finding A: The social/economic and family/individual factors that contribute to criminal behavior (and other associated problems) are well documented, complex, inter-related, consistent, and generally evident early in a child's life. Poverty, ethnic/racial disparities, and community conditions are all powerful influences in a

child's early life. Additionally, dysfunctional families, early anti-social behaviors in children, and negative peers can all contribute to the onset of criminal behavior. Finally, prevailing community opinion and changing public policy has increased the odds of becoming involved and staying involved in the criminal justices system, especially for men of color.

Finding B: There is solid empirical evidence that effective programs mitigate these factors. And, there are 120 early childhood and school aged programs designed for at-risk children, families and individuals that meet rigorous evaluation criteria and have been found to be effective in reducing crime and/or the factors that contribute to criminal behavior. These 120 programs provide a menu of proven upstream program options for County Departments. There are fewer published cost benefit analyses of upstream interventions so the list of programs that have been found to be both effective and cost beneficial is smaller.

Based on Findings A and B (above), the Board approved one recommendation related to evidence-based practice:

Expand the County's evaluation of existing and potential Health and Human Service and Criminal Justice programs using published evidence, outcome monitoring, and cost benefit analyses.

Upstream Ad Hoc Committee (April 2010 through October 2011)

In April, 2010, the Board of Supervisors convened an Upstream Ad Hoc Committee to implement the recommendations approved by the Board on January 11, 2010, including the recommendation related evidence-based practice. The Ad Hoc Committee charter committed to seven deliverables and delegated staff to four workgroups. One deliverable was related to evidence-based practice:

Deliverable 1 – Current Program Portfolio: List of current programs offered by County and partner organizations that reflect upstream principles as defined by committee.

In August 2010, the Human Services Department convened Workgroup 1 with eight members representing Sonoma County Office of Education, United Way of the Wine Country, District Attorney's Office, Human Services Department, Child Support Services, Department of Health Services, Community Development Commission, and Boys and Girls Club.

This group met monthly from August 2010 through February 12. They developed and pilot tested the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs. They are referred to throughout this manual as "Workgroup 1."

Upstream Investments Policy Committee (January 2012 through December 2013)

In November 2011 the Board of Supervisors convened the Upstream Investments Policy Committee for a two-year period. The Board also formalized the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs by chartering a Board Appointed Portfolio Review Committee and delegating staff of the Human Services Department to support the Review Committee.

This manual describes the thinking and recommendations of Workgroup 1, and the decisions of the Upstream Ad Hoc Committee and the Board of Supervisors, through February 2012. The first meeting of the Board Appointed Portfolio Review Committee was held in March 2012. Changes made to the Portfolio policies and procedures since March 2012, by the Portfolio Review Committee or by Human Services Department staff, are noted in this manual and serve as an historical record of the development of the Portfolio.

b. Literature Review

ADD

c. Definitions

The following terms have different meanings in different contexts and do not have definitive definitions. The definitions provided here describe how the terms are used in the context of the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs.

UPSTREAM: Upstream is an emphasis on prevention-focused intervention and policies for children, families, individuals, and the community to increase equality and promote opportunities that reduce future monetary and societal costs.

PROGRAMS: Throughout the community, there are many categories of activities that may reflect upstream principles. In this manual, the term “programs” is broadly defined to include a variety of activities that may also be called strategies, practices, approaches or interventions. It is the intent of the Upstream Investments Policy Committee to be inclusive and include a wide variety of “programs.”

CLIENTS: Similarly, throughout the community, County Departments and community partners provide services to community members. In this manual, the term “client” is broadly defined to include residents, participants, students, consumers, target populations, and communities served. Again, it is the intent of the Upstream Investments Policy Committee to be inclusive and to include a wide variety of “clients.”

EVIDENCE-BASED PRACTICE: As used here, evidence-based practices are “gold standard” programs – those programs that have been empirically proven to produce positive outcomes. Generally, evidence-based practices meet similar criteria: rigorous evaluation using experimental or quasi-experimental design, publication in a peer-reviewed journal, sustained effect, replication and reliability. When evidence-based practices are implemented in communities, fidelity with the original model is critical for the realization of desired outcomes. The following website provides a good history of evidence-based practice in the care of individual clients and as a social movement: http://sophia.smith.edu/~jdrisko/evidence_based_practice.htm.

EVIDENCE-INFORMED INFORMED: **SEE KATIE'S WRITEUP**

FIDELITY: Fidelity is the extent to which a program is implemented in a way that adheres to the protocol or model of the originally developed and evaluated program. Programs that are implemented with fidelity can demonstrate that they match the original program in the following dimensions: adherence, dose/exposure, quality of program delivery, and participant responsiveness. Local implementations of evidence-based programs sometimes result in adaptations to the original model. Adaptations are acceptable or not depending on their scope and estimated impact on desired outcomes. See Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs: INSTRUCTIONS for more information fidelity as used in the Portfolio.

d. Purpose of the Portfolio

The purpose of the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs is to be a comprehensive portfolio of evidence-informed prevention programs throughout Sonoma County. This Portfolio is important because it expands community-wide capacity to identify, implement, and fund evidence-informed prevention-focused programs. The Portfolio is a three-tiered clearinghouse of local evidence-based, promising, and emerging practices. The criteria for each tier represent a national and local consensus about the requirements for the three different levels of evidence-informed practice.

e. Benefits of the Portfolio

When the Portfolio was conceived and developed, there was no existing, comprehensive and accurate list of existing upstream programs throughout Sonoma County. The Portfolio was developed to achieve the following benefits:

1. Increase capacity to apply for and receive funding for upstream programs.
2. Identify existing effective and cost beneficial upstream programs and target funding and resources to these programs.
3. Validate and acknowledge the effective work currently being done throughout the county.
4. Promote replication of successful and cost beneficial upstream programs.

5. Identify and understand the gaps in upstream investments throughout the community. (including geographic gaps).
6. Identify duplicate programs (if any) and make adjustments (if necessary).
7. Plan to expand funding for and referrals to effective and cost beneficial upstream programs.
8. Understand what upstream programs work best for which clients (one size does not fit all).
9. Strengthen County/community partner collaborations and partnerships related to upstream programs.
10. Explain to the community, to funders, and to clients why some upstream programs are selected over others.
11. Demonstrate to taxpayers that the County makes wise, responsible and forward-thinking fiscal decisions.
12. Expand County and public recognition of the value of investing in upstream programs and the value of children.
13. Increase community commitment to upstream programs through volunteerism.
14. Help to populate the 2-1-1 referral list.

f. Assumptions Inherent in the Portfolio

Intro

1. Evidence-based upstream programs exist in Sonoma County.
2. Although the County and community partners are, through the Upstream Investments policy, increasing a focus on upstream interventions, intervention programs will always still be needed.
3. Although it is the intent to use this Portfolio to inform budgetary decisions, this Portfolio will not be the sole criteria for budget decisions.
4. The intent of this Portfolio is not to eliminate the design of new programs but to encourage the design and implementation of existing and new programs in a way that progressively meets standards for evidence-based practice.

II. Portfolio Logic Model

DEVELOP

III. Portfolio Governance

Governance of the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs and the Review Committee is provided by seven groups. The specific criteria for and roles of each group are detailed in the Review Committee Bylaws (Appendix X) and the Portfolio Application and Review Process (Appendix X)

- a. The Board of Supervisors makes policy decisions related to the Portfolio and approve members of the Review Committee. Board decisions to date are described in Appendix X which includes:
 - 1) Upstream Investments pages 56-57 (January 2010),
 - 2) Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Overview for Board of Supervisors and Agenda Item Summary Report (January 2011)
 - 2) Progress Report and Recommended Next Steps pages 8-9 (November 2011),
 - 3) Progress Report and Next Steps pages 7-10 (February 2013)
- b. The Board of Supervisors appoints volunteer members of the Portfolio Review Committee. The Portfolio Review Committee has two roles: 1) Review submissions to the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs in accordance with the Portfolio Review and Decision Process and to determine Tier Placement for each submission; and 2) Ensuring 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 and to make recommendations for changes in both to the Upstream Policy Committee when appropriate.
- c. The Board of Supervisors delegates the Human Services Department to provide staff support to the Portfolio.
- d. The Upstream Investments Policy Committee and Executive Committee provide direction and develop policy recommendations for the Board of Supervisor as necessary.
- e. The Upstream Investments Policy Committee delegates members of the Portfolio Appeal Committee who make final determinations about Portfolio placements when applications are not satisfied with the Review Committee decision.
- f. Sonoma County Counsel provides legal support as necessary.

IV. Users of the Portfolio

a. Service Providers

The Portfolio provides a structured and concrete method for service providers to expand their capacity to deliver evidence-informed services (community based providers and County Departments).

b. Local Funders

The Portfolio also provides local funders with an objective, third party assessment of a program's rigor related to implementation science and outcomes. When an organization works to meet the requirements of our Portfolio, they are inherently becoming more evidence-informed – which is what funders want. The Portfolio provides local funders with a list of local programs that are prevention-focused and that meet minimal standards for effectiveness. The Portfolio is a way to encourage funders to be prudent and wise with their investments and it provides an external, objective, standardize, pre-screening or “seal of approval” for funders.

Local funders promote the Upstream Investment principles (invest early, wisely, together) in their funding activities as follows:

Requests for Proposals (RFPs)

- Requiring programs to be prevention-focused.
- Requiring responders to have a Resolution of Alignment.
- Providing bonus points for programs on the Portfolio.
- Requiring responding programs to be on the Portfolio.
- For grantees that are not on the Portfolio, requiring a discussion about why not and reports about progress towards a submission to the Portfolio.

Contracts

- Requiring contracted programs to be on the Portfolio to maintain contract funding.
- Discussing upstream principles in contract-monitoring site visits.

Technical Assistance

- Funding training and certification for grantees about specific evidence-based practices.
- Supporting grantees to successfully meet the Portfolio requirements by hosting Portfolio workshops, referring grantees to Upstream staff for Portfolio application assistance, and/or providing direct assistance to grantees as grantee prepare their Portfolio application.

c. Outreach to Users

The Human Services Department educates local service providers and local funders about the Portfolio in the following ways:

- Frequent (monthly) one-hour information sessions that introduce the Upstream Investments policy including a discussion of the Portfolio.
- Regular (quarterly) three-hour workshops during which service providers begin a Portfolio application.
- Ad Hoc (as needed) meetings of service providers and/or funders to check in about how the Portfolio is working and to collectively develop next steps.
- Individual interactions between HSD staff and local service providers and funders to answer questions and concerns, and build support, for the Portfolio
- A technical assistance program staffed by an employee of the Human Services Department and supported by the activities of a variety of partners.

V. Portfolio Implementation Practices

This section describes the application review, decision and appeal processes to ensure a transparent, fair, and consistent process. This description also facilitates replication of the Portfolio in other localities.

a. Technical Assistance

DEVELOP

b. Application Submission

Organizations are invited to submit their application via an e-mail to info@SonomaUpstream.org. All applications are required to include a Pre-Requisites Form and Program Description Form. All applications are also required to include one of the Tier Application Forms: Tier 1, Tier 2, or Tier 3. Applicants apply for a specific Tier. Required application documents are all found at http://www.sonomaupstream.org/html/add_form.asp. Applications can be submitted in any electronic format. The Human Services Department will convert them to PDF before sending them to reviewers. Assistance with the application process is available by calling 707.565.5800 or by e-mailing to info@SonomaUpstream.org.

c. Application Processing

When a program is submitted to the Portfolio, the Human Services Department will review it within three days to determine if all required documents are included and will communicate with the submitter if anything is missing, incomplete, or very unlikely to be approved by the reviewers. The Human Services Department will provide technical assistance to the submitter and will not forward the application to a reviewer until it is complete. The Human Services Department, at its own discretion, will work with the submitter when the application is very unlikely to be approved by the reviewers. The Human Services Department cannot predict the reviewers' decision; however the Human Services Department is familiar with the criteria for Tier placement and the reviewer's application of those criteria. In some cases, it is very clear that an application will not be deemed to meet the criteria. Because a submitter

is only allowed two reviews to meet the criteria before being denied placement on the Portfolio, the Human Services Department helps the submitter improve their application in cases where the first review is highly likely to fail, thereby increasing their likelihood of being accepted to the Portfolio. If the submitter is unwilling or unable to make changes to their application, the Human Services Department will submit it to the reviewers.

When all required documents are complete, the Human Services Department will convert all documents to PDF and send the complete application, with the appropriate Tier scoring sheet, to two members of the Portfolio Review Committee (the reviewers do not know the identity of each other). In making the reviewer selection, the Human Services Department selects the next two reviewers on the list. When a reviewer receives an application, their name is rotated to the bottom of the list.

The two reviewers immediately look at the application and determine whether or not they have a conflict of interest. If either of the reviewers has a conflict of interest or are otherwise unable to complete the review in three business days, they will immediately (within 24 hours of receiving the application) notify the Human Services Department who will send the application to a different reviewer. In this case, the reviewers name stays at the top of the list and the reviewer is assigned the next review. Other than conflict of interest, the only reason that a reviewer will decline to complete the review is if they are starting a vacation or sick leave within the three day review window.

d. Application Review

Within three business days, the two reviewers independently conduct a review to determine if the program meets the criteria for the requested tier placement. The two reviewers independently complete a score sheet that matches the criteria described in the Portfolio Instructions and listed on the Tier application forms. Blank score sheets are available on www.SonomaUpstream.org so that applicants are aware of the review criteria.

e. Reviewer Consistency / Inter-rater Reliability

While the criteria for each Tier of the Portfolio are very specific, interpreting whether or not a program meets the criteria requires the judgment of the reviewers. To facilitate consistency (inter-rater reliability) between reviewers, the following processes exist:

1. If the two reviewers independently make different decisions about Tier placement, the application is brought to the Review Committee for whole Committee discussion and decision. This ensures that applications with more ambiguity have the benefit of the Committee's collective discussion and decision.

2. In most cases, the two reviewers agree on Tier placement. In these cases, the successful Tier placement is reported at the next Review Committee meeting and the two reviewers are invited to debrief their decision-making and check their thinking with the other reviewer and the full committee.
3. If a reviewer has questions or a lack of clarity, he/she can contact the Human Services Department. While the Human Services Department staff are not authorized to influence the reviewer's decision, they can remind the reviewer of past discussions at and decisions of the Review Committee.
4. Official Portfolio documents (ByLaws, Manual, Instructions, Application Forms) include all required components of an application. Occasionally, the Review Committee makes official changes (through a vote) to an official document to more adequately describe the intent of the Committee and/or to align Portfolio practices with generally accepted thinking in the field. These changes are documented in meeting minutes and the official document is changed. Sometimes, the Review Committee does not officially change an official document but does have a discussion that clarifies the Committee's intent and further standardizes committee activities. These discussions are also documented in meeting minutes. These discussions that reflect the Committee's thinking and decision process are documented thematically in Appendix X (Record of Upstream Portfolio Changes)

f. Reviewer Decision

The two reviewers independently report their decision, by e-mailing a completed scoring sheet, to the Human Services Department. The decision is either approval for Tier placement, or non-approval for Tier placement. The decision is a definitive yes or no for the Tier for which the program applied. The reviewer includes comments that explain their decision. These comments must relate to specific Tier criteria and should be written in a manner that can be shared with the applicant and which supports learning and growth within the submitting organization, and is actionable. It may appropriate for the reviewer to suggest that the program consider applying for a different Tier.

1. Unanimous Decision to Approve

If both reviewers independently determine the program fits the criteria for the requested tier placement, the review is complete. The Human Services Department does the following:

- Notifies the submitting organization via a standard e-mail (where?) which includes a Tier "medal" that the organization can use in their own marketing
- Documents the decision in the Portfolio database
- Lists the program on www.SonomaUpstream.org
- Files the application and all related documents in the Portfolio Approved Application Binders.

- Ensures that the application and all related documents are filed electronically in the Upstream Portfolio Applications folder.

2. Unanimous Decision to Not Approve

If both reviewers independently determine the program does not fit the criteria for the requested tier placement, the Human Services Department will notify the submitting organization with a phone call (or a face-to-face meeting if appropriate). This notification will be supportive and will include an offer to help adapt the program so it meets Portfolio criteria. The personal notification will be followed with a standard e-mail notification. The e-mail notification includes a Progress Report (where?). The Progress Report includes the reviewers decision for each item and the reviewers comments (or summary thereof if the comments are not actionable). The program may re-submit the sections of their application that did not meet criteria. If they do, the same two independent reviewers receive the revised application for re-review. If, with the additional information, both reviewers independently determine the program fits the criteria for Tier placement, the review is complete and the submitting organization will be notified as explained in g1. above. If, with the additional information, both reviewers independently determine the program still does not fit the criteria for tier placement, the submitter will be notified personally and via e-mail that they did not meet the criteria and why. The review is complete. The submitter can do nothing, re-apply **in time frame**, or appeal (described in **III.** below). **DIFFICULTY WHEN REVIEWERS ARE WIDELY DISPARATE – OR WHEN ALL SECTIONS ARE NOT APPROVED.**

3. Non-Unanimous Decision

If the two independent reviewers submit different decisions, the application is Portfolio Review Committee meeting for discussion and a vote. The process is as follows.

- The applicant is notified personally and via e-mail of the split-decision and the scheduled meeting. The applicant is invited to attend the meeting and make a three minute public comment after the Committee discussion and before the Committee vote.
- The agenda for the Committee meeting is published at the Board of Supervisors offices, on www.SonomaUpstream.org at 72 business hours before the meeting. The agenda is also sent to the Committee members and each applicant on the agenda. The agenda includes the Tier criteria that has not been met and that will be discussed. Only Tier criteria that one or both reviewers noted as not meeting criteria will be discussed and voted upon. All other criteria are met.
- Committee members are sent a link where they can review the full application (but not the reviewers score sheets). At this point, the full application is not yet subject to the Public Records Act and is not made

public. Completed applications are subject to Public Records Act and may be requested per Board Policy (cite). (Parts of applications that are considered excellent are used by the Human Services Department, with the permission of the applicant, in training and as an example for other applicants.)

- At the Committee meeting, a quorum, including both reviewers, is required to discuss applications and make Tier placement decisions. The discussion is facilitated by the Human Services Department staff and proceeds as follows:

– DESCRIBE DISCUSSION PROCESS

If the Committee votes to approve Tier Placement, the application proceeds as in g1. above. If the Committee votes to not approve Tier placement, the application proceeds in g2. above. If both reviewers have a non-unanimous decision on the second review, the application comes to Committee again for a second time and proceeds g3. above with one exception; this Committee decision is final and completes the application.

g. Appeal Process

If an organization is not satisfied with the decision regarding their tier placement, the organization has a right to appeal of the decision. The organization may appeal the accuracy of the decision but may not appeal the tier criteria. (In other words, they may appeal on the basis that they do in fact meet the criteria, but they may not appeal based on the idea that the criteria should be changed.) The Appeal Process proceeds as follows.