



## Portfolio Review Committee Agenda

August 21, 2013 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

1202 Apollo Way, Santa Rosa, Shiloh Room

All supporting documents are available at [www.SonomaUpstream.org](http://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](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org) or call 707.565.5800.

**1:00 Welcome, Introductions, Agenda ACTION ITEM**

*Approve Minutes with revisions from July meeting*

**1:10 Updates & Reports**

*Update on Dr. Bischoff's new role*

*Update on portfolio activity since last meeting*

*Update on Manual Revisions*

*Clearinghouse program renewal research*

**1:20 Approve Logic Model ACTION ITEM**

**1:30 Approve forms ACTION ITEM**

**1:50 Approve renewal process ACTION ITEM**

**2:10 Approve process for managing renewals due in the next 3 months ACTION ITEM**

**2:20 Approve time limit change ACTION ITEM**

*Reviewers will be allowed 5 days instead of 3 to return reviews*

**2:25 Applications to the Portfolio**

*No Reviews*

**2:30 Discussion Items**

*Fidelity*

**3:15 Public comment**

**3:30 Adjourn**

### Upcoming Meetings

September 18<sup>th</sup>, 2013, 2550 Paulin Dr.

October 16<sup>th</sup>, 2013, 3600 Westwind Blvd

November 20<sup>th</sup>, 2013, 3600 Westwind Blvd

December 18<sup>th</sup>, 2013, 3600 Westwind Blvd



Wednesday, July 17, 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  
 Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office  
 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  
 Caryn Henkel, Human Services Department  
 Marla Stuart, Human Services Department  
 Megan Sirna, Human Services Department  
 Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Guests (listed alphabetically)

Brian Vaughn, First 5 Sonoma County

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Susan Castillo, Department of Health Services  
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department  
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
<b>Welcome, Introductions, Minutes</b>	<p>Introductions.</p> <p>To assist with the staffing transition, the Human Services Department plans to contract with someone to support the Portfolio including facilitating the meetings. We are planning to contract with B.J. Bischoff to manage the Portfolio Review Committee. Marla Stuart will be retained on contract as a thought leader.</p> <p>Corrections to the Minutes: Minutes should say Larissa has been promoted to <i>the</i> probation department.</p> <p><b>Motion</b> to approve the minutes, with corrections.</p>	<p>Motion: Dan          Second: Carlos          Yes: 12          No: 0</p>	<p>None</p>
<b>Updates &amp; Reports</b>	<p><b>Update on Portfolio activities since last meeting.</b></p> <p>Tackling Tough Skills is receiving Technical Assistance. Since our last meeting 4C's, CPI and Volunteer Center have also received Technical Assistance. Joni Thacher will follow-up with the programs that we are awaiting information from.</p> <p><b>CHOICE</b></p> <p>Most reviewers have not seen CHOICE's complete evaluation. CHOICE will submit to the Portfolio Review Committee as a program and, should it be approved, its sub-programs will be</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>A study session about fidelity will be added to the August agenda.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>listed on the portfolio as part of CHOICE.</p> <p><i>Suggested Revision:</i></p> <p><i>Many reviewers have not seen CHOICE's complete evaluation. CHOICE will submit to the Portfolio Review Committee as a program and, should it be approved, its sub-programs will need to submit their own application to be included on the Portfolio. However, if CHOICE is approved the sub-programs will be able to reference it in their Evaluation.</i></p> <p><b>First 5 and Positive Parenting Programs</b></p> <p>Upstream may conduct a study about child maltreatment rates for Triple P recipients</p> <p>Because Positive Parenting Programs is a Tier 1 program and requires fidelity monitoring, First 5 will offer fidelity support to the Positive Parenting Program providers.</p> <p>Fidelity is an evaluation approach that shows an organization is implementing their program according to the model standard. It can include control of delivery, time and process.</p>		
<b>Applications</b>	There are no programs to review this month.	None	None
<b>Discussion Items:</b> <b>Logic Model</b>	<p><b>Logic Model</b></p> <p>Committee reviewed <i>Sonoma County Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs DRAFT Logic Model</i>. Committee offered the following suggestions for changes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>References need to be added. A footnote pointing readers to page 57 of the original report would also be acceptable.</li> </ul> <p>Problem Statement Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Don't use the term "well documented."</li> <li>Problem: We have determined in our community there is the need to increase the number of programs using evidence informed practice. Solution: Develop a structure to increase the number of programs using evidence informed practice.</li> </ul> <p>Inputs Discussion: (What allows us to be successful)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We have a common value to use evidence based practices.</li> <li>Services providers are committed to doing the work required to submit to the portfolio.</li> <li>Revise first input to read: "Commitment by the Board of Supervisors to support Portfolio, and to support Appeal Committee decisions."</li> </ul> <p>Assumptions Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The collective value held by funders around evaluation.</li> <li>Funders are increasingly funding the evaluation resources non-profits need. We expect to expand and sustain these practices.</li> <li>There is a collective community value around evaluation.</li> </ul>	None	Portfolio staff will make the suggested changes to the Logic Model and distribute for review.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Services exist in our community. (This could also be an input).</li> <li>• Evidence-based models exist outside our community that can be replicated here. (This could also be an input).</li> <li>• Clearinghouses exist. (This could also be an input).</li> <li>• Research exists. (This could also be an input).</li> <li>• The Board of Supervisors’ support of Upstream, its decisions and expectations should be listed under assumptions.</li> <li>• There is an expectation in the County plan that Upstream’s principles will be upheld.</li> <li>• We are committed to being a public process. We are governed by the Brown Act and will be transparent. This could also be included under Inputs.</li> </ul> <p>Output Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Portfolio Review Committee will document their process.</li> <li>• We are building collective/shared values.</li> </ul> <p>Outcomes Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We will increase the size of the portfolio.</li> <li>• There will be more evidence informed practice in the community.</li> <li>• There will be a renewal process.</li> <li>• There will be a growing community will for the use of evidence based practices.</li> <li>• The committee’s knowledge will continue to grow. We are practicing Implementation Science and increasing our ability to do so.</li> <li>• We will add to the body of knowledge and should publish our work.</li> <li>• Services are more effective in addressing issues in the community.</li> <li>• There should be a footnote defining community conditions. The footnote should define or point to a definition that includes the 6 categories.</li> <li>• Service providers will increase their capacity.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Discussion Items:</b> <b>Renewal Process</b></p>	<p><b>Renewal Process</b> (brainstorming and discussion but no decisions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to find out what National Clearinghouses do for renewals.</li> <li>• If they are going to stay on the same tier, it should be easy. They should only supply documents if things have changed.</li> </ul> <p><b>Tier 3</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tier 3 organizations should be sent reminders 24, 12, 6 and 3 months before their reapplication is due. To move up to Tier 2, they will have to submit a full Tier 2 application.</li> <li>• What if they don’t have the funds to do the evaluations?</li> <li>• Is it reasonable to assume that start-up organizations will have reliable strong evaluations after only 3 years?</li> </ul>		<p>The Upstream staff will review current evidence on review process. We will also find out what Tier the current organizations up for renewal are.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can we set up regular workshops to help Tier 3 organizations? We should prioritize the new Technical Assistant PPEA to help Tier 3 organizations.</li> <li>• It may take a while with tweaking and changes to establish evaluations and outcomes. If this is the case could we allow them to reapply as a Tier 3?</li> <li>• If they are going to reapply they will need to have used their data to restructure their program. There would need to be a new evaluation plan in place. They would also need to show an updated literature review and logic model. There would need to be a second evaluation in progress.</li> <li>• The easiest process would be to allow them to reapply for Tier 3. They would need to resubmit everything and include a one page summary of the changes they've made since their original application to reflect self-reflection and learning.</li> </ul> <p><b>Tier 1</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reapplication should show that they are still on a Clearinghouse list.</li> <li>• They need to show fidelity. If there have been adaptations to the model these should be clearly articulated.</li> <li>• Do we require self reflection? Changes in staff could make self reflection difficult. How can we capture the need for self reflection without being onerous? It is our role to encourage learning and growth? They need to acknowledge and reflect on the following changes: need of the population, resources, internal, external, evaluation results and current research.</li> <li>• If we are going to include self reflection at the time of renewal that needs to be included in the original instructions. To add a new element unfairly penalizes organizations that have been on the portfolio for a while.</li> <li>• From a funders and grant makers perspective, there is great value in self reflection. We want to see internal and external changes articulated.</li> <li>• Could we have a renewal cover page? If we do it should be scored otherwise they are unlikely to put much effort into it.</li> <li>• We could create a new "Tier 1 Plus" category for programs that have been renewed. It would show longevity.</li> <li>• Our requirements should ultimately help the organization be more effective as they serve the public.</li> </ul> <p><b>Tier 2</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• They should be able to reapply with a cover sheet that articulates all changes (literature review, logic model, manual, evaluation).</li> <li>• To remain at Tier 2 do you need to have a local evaluation if your original evaluation was external?</li> </ul>		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to continue to grow and change as the Portfolio Review Committee. This is an opportunity for us to increase standardization for Tier 2.</li> <li>• We need to see that evaluation has continued. How often? Annually? Every 3 years?</li> <li>• What if an organization loses funding after their initial Tier 2 approval and they no longer have the funds for evaluation? Will we require a new evaluation to stay at the Tier 2 level?</li> <li>• They should be able to reapply. We will continue to grow and make changes to the Tier 2 application process. It will become increasingly rigorous. It won't be the same as it was 3 years prior. They will be held to the new standard and evaluated by a new set of eyes. Three years of changes may push them off of Tier 2. If their own practices haven't evolved their old evaluation won't measure up. Their application will speak for itself.</li> <li>• However, if they aren't approved for Tier 2 status after they reapply we need to be prepared to tell them why.</li> <li>• We need to review our goals as a committee. We are trying to continually up the ante on evidence informed service in our community. We must build into our system increased rigor for local evaluations. For Tier 2 this should include a time frame for evaluations. Three years would be reasonable.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Discussion Items:</b> <b>Manual</b></p>	<p><b>Manual</b> Page 11</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– We need to establish a shared expectation for when a reviewer can deny a review. It would be reasonable to deny a review if you are 5 business days away from a vacation.</li> <li>– Does everyone get 1 “skip” per year? (no)</li> <li>– Why don't we give Joni or Caryn notice if we're going to be out of town for an extended period of time. (no)</li> <li>– We could all select a month during which we would be responsible for all the reviews that came in. (no)</li> <li>– You should decline the review if you know you can't make it to the meeting. (yes)</li> </ul> <p>Page 12</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comments need to be able to be presented to the applicant. They should be courteous and promote further growth and learning.</li> </ul> <p>Page 13</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Committee members should get the reviewers score cards before the meeting.</li> </ul>		<p>Upstream staff to send a revised manual for review.</p>

<b>Next Meeting</b>	The next meeting will be on August 21. The location has not been determined, watch for an email with instructions.	None	Upstream staff to send information about location.
<b>Adjourn</b>	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 August 21, 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 July 17, 2013

	Submission Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Activity Date	Status
1	6/28/13	Triple P Parenting	YWCA	8/1/13	Technical assistance
2	6/19/13	MAYi	MAYi	8/12/13	Technical assistance
3	6/7/13	Triple P Parenting	Russian River Counselors	8/1/13	Technical assistance
4	5/17/13	Tackling Tough Skills	Goodwill Redwood Empire	8/14/13	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	8/7/13
2	TBD	CPI	6/24/13
3	TBD	Volunteer Center	6/24/13
4	TBD	Mentor Me Petaluma	8/8/13



**Other active submissions with no activity since July 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 Programs LOGIC MODEL



**Problem:** 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:** Evidence-based prevention programs mitigate these challenges. **Problem:** Incorporating evidence-informed practices within organizations can be confusing and complex. Moreover, the lack of standardized approaches to evidence-informed practice among funders and regulatory bodies can be burdensome to service providers. **Solution:** 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.
- 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

- Service providers become resistant to incorporating evidence in their practice.
- Funders become resistant to using the Portfolio as one funding criteria.
- The Board of Supervisors becomes unwilling to support 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 TERM	LONG TERM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitment by the Board of Supervisors to support Portfolio and Appeal Committee decisions.</li> <li>• Commitment by funders to use the Portfolio as one of their funding criteria.</li> <li>• Private and organizational volunteers who will commit the time necessary to serve on the Portfolio Committee.</li> <li>• Staff to support the Portfolio (1 Admin Aide and 1 manager)</li> <li>• Commitment by service providers to dedicate resources to submitting their programs to the Portfolio.</li> </ul>	<p>The Portfolio Review Committee engages in the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reviews applications and renewals to the Portfolio in accordance with the Portfolio Review and Decision Process and determine Tier Placement for each application.</li> <li>• Publishes a list of programs that meet the criteria for each Tier.</li> <li>• 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</li> <li>• Maintains documentation that fully describes the committee’s processes and change in thinking over time for the purpose of facilitating replication.</li> <li>• Promotes transparency and public accountability by ensuring opportunity for public access to and input to Portfolio activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> </ul> <p>Local service-delivery providers will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve their capacity to incorporate evidence in their program design, implementation and evaluation.</li> <li>• Increase their capacity to apply for and receive funding for prevention programs.</li> <li>• Deliver more evidence-informed prevention-based services.</li> </ul> <p>Local funders will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify local effective prevention programs and target funding and resources to these programs.</li> <li>• Promote replication of successful and cost beneficial prevention programs.</li> <li>• Expand referrals to effective and cost beneficial prevention programs.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Children, families and individuals facing extraordinary challenges and barriers will be more likely to succeed as a result of increasingly more effective services.</li> <li>• Sonoma County will publish its experiences and contribute to the body of knowledge about implementation science.</li> </ul> <p>The following risk factors will decline in the community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Societal and Economic Factors</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Poverty and Racial/Ethnic Disparities</li> <li>– Adverse community conditions</li> <li>– Punitive opinions, policies, and laws that advance incarceration over prevention</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Family and Individual Factors</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Family dysfunction</li> <li>• Early anti-social behavior</li> <li>• Negative peer influences</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>We will collectively improve the following indicators of success</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Child maltreatment</li> <li>• Youth binge drinking</li> <li>• Youth drug use</li> <li>• Youth depression</li> <li>• Youth tobacco use</li> <li>• Teen births</li> <li>• Childhood obesity</li> <li>• Pre-school attendance</li> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> grade reading</li> <li>• 3<sup>rd</sup> grade math</li> <li>• High school completion</li> <li>• Higher education</li> <li>• Housing affordability</li> <li>• Homelessness</li> <li>• Juvenile arrests</li> <li>• Adult arrests</li> <li>• Domestic violence</li> <li>• Gang membership</li> <li>• Youth connectedness</li> <li>• Poverty</li> <li>• Unemployment</li> <li>• Health insurance</li> </ul>



# UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

## Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs: INSTRUCTIONS

**INTRODUCTION:** *The Sonoma County Upstream Investments Policy Committee has created a portfolio of current and planned County and partner programs that reflect upstream principles. The Board invites County Departments and community partners to submit current and planned upstream programs to be included in this Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs. This document provides specific INSTRUCTIONS about how to nominate an upstream program to be included in the Upstream Portfolio. To submit a program, complete and submit the APPLICATION FORMS available at [www.SonomaUpstream.org](http://www.SonomaUpstream.org) or contact Upstream at 565.5800 or [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org).*

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. Definitions.....	Page 2
B. Purpose and Benefits of Portfolio.....	2
C. Portfolio Application and Review .....	3
D. Portfolio Contents .....	3
E. Disclaimer.....	3
F. Program Description.....	3
G. PreRequisites .....	4
H. Tier 1: Evidence-Based Practice.....	7
• Evidence-Based Clearinghouse	
• Fidelity	
I. Tier 2: Promising Practice .....	9
• Literature Review	
• Logic Model	
• Manual	
• Evaluation	
• More than one Cohort	
J. Tier 3: Emerging Practice .....	12
• Literature Review	
• Logic Model	
• Policies and Procedures	
• Evaluation Plan	

## A. DEFINITIONS

### 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 these documents, 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 these documents, 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.”

## B. PURPOSE and BENEFITS of PORTFOLIO

There is no other existing, comprehensive and accurate portfolio of existing outcome-based upstream programs throughout Sonoma County. Having such a portfolio helps the County and community partners to individually and collaboratively do the following:

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.

### **C. PORTFOLIO APPLICATION and REVIEW**

1. Programs are invited to submit a completed APPLICATION FORM and requested documents to [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org). Technical assistance is available and encouraged.
2. Two independent raters will review the submission and recommend placement. Raters will recuse themselves from rating a program if they have a conflict of interest.
3. For more information, see “Application Review and Decision Process.”
4. All programs must apply for renewal after 3 years from approval. Organizations will be notified 6 months in advance.

### **D. PORTFOLIO CONTENTS**

When published, the portfolio will include the following information about the included programs. It is hoped that the list will be useful to a wide audience (Fundors, Board of Supervisors, Department Heads, Program Managers, Clients, Volunteers, Taxpayers) for decision-making.

1. Program name
2. Evidence-Based Tier
3. Implementing Organization name
4. Program website (if applicable)
5. Funding source(s)

### **E. DISCLAIMER**

- a. Inclusion in the Portfolio of Upstream Programs indicates that the program meets the criteria set forth for the particular Tier; it does not constitute an endorsement of the program by the County of Sonoma.
- b. All applications to the Portfolio are public documents pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act.

## F. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

Contact information is requested so the Portfolio reviewers can communicate with the Submitting organization. The Program Description will be used by the Portfolio reviewers to gain a basic understanding of the program. The Application Form requests the following.

1. Program name
2. Organization
3. Contact name
4. Contact phone number
5. Contact e-mail address
6. Program website (if one exists)
7. Program description
8. Program service location(s)
9. Implementer(s)
10. Clients
11. Funding source(s)/Budget

## G. PREREQUISITES

All programs that are included in the Upstream Portfolio will meet the following four prerequisites.

1. Prevention-Focused: 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. To meet this prerequisite, a program will provide services in one or more of the following categories.
  - a. Health promotion (for example: alcohol and drug prevention, mental health, pre-natal, family planning and teen pregnancy reduction)
  - b. Education (for example: child care, preschool, K-12)
  - c. Community development (for example: economic development, parks and recreation)
  - d. Family support (for example: family interventions, parenting support, fatherhood)
  - e. Financial literacy
  - f. Health care and insurance
  - g. Criminal diversion programs (including first-time juvenile and adult offenders)
  - h. Life skills (for example: job skills, job readiness, civic involvement, volunteering)
  - i. One stop centers (for example: Family Justice Center, Job Link)
  - j. Geographically targeted (for example: Roseland Community Action Zone)
  - k. Programs and strategies that mitigate or improve negative peer influences and/or improve resiliency (for example: mentoring, gang prevention)
  - l. Violence prevention (for example: domestic violence, child abuse and neglect)
  - m. Basic needs (for example: shelter, food)
  - n. Programs that target early system entrants (for example: program that are designed for individuals who use any County service for the first time)
  - o. Other (please describe)

2. Factors Addressed: The Upstream Investment Policy Committee has determined that nine upstream factors contribute to downstream need for services. These factors are well documented, consistent, and generally evident early in a child’s life. These factors are fully described in *Upstream Investments* (January 11, 2010), pages 8-32. To meet this prerequisite, programs will provide services that address one or more of the following factors.

- a. Poverty
- b. Racial and ethnic disparities
- c. Community conditions
- d. Public opinion, public policy, and laws
- e. Family dysfunction
- f. Negative peer influences
- g. Early antisocial behavior
- h. Substance abuse
- i. Academic concerns

3. Local Relevancy: In Sonoma County, several community-wide collaborations have identified widely held and promoted values and indicators of success that reflect upstream investments. Programs and strategies included in the Upstream Portfolio will target priorities and indicators of success promoted by one or more community-wide collaborations. Including local relevancy in evidence-based practice is sometimes referred to as “value-driven evidence-based practice.”<sup>1</sup> To meet this prerequisite, programs will provide services that fit with the values of one or more of the following community collaboratives:

- a. Upstream Investments
- b. Health Action
- c. Innovation Council
- d. First 5
- e. Measure O Mayor’s Gang Prevention Task Force
- f. Child Care Planning Council
- g. Continuum of Care
- h. Cradle to Career
- i. Aiming High Consortium
- j. Community Health Needs Assessment
- k. County of Sonoma Strategic Plan
- l. Mental Health Services Act
- m. Partnership for Children
- n. Prevent Child Abuse Sonoma
- o. Sonoma County BEST
- p. Other

---

<sup>1</sup> California Institute for Mental Health (CIMH). [www.cimh.org/Initiatives/Evidence-Based-Parctice.aspx](http://www.cimh.org/Initiatives/Evidence-Based-Parctice.aspx).



4. **Indicators Addressed:** The Upstream Investments Policy promotes a shared commitment to achieving community outcomes. Part of participating in Upstream is committing to implement programs that positively effect these outcomes.

- a. Child Maltreatment
- b. Youth Binge Drinking
- c. Youth Drug Use
- d. Youth Depression
- e. Youth Tobacco Use
- f. Teen Births
- g. Obesity
- h. Pre-School Attendance
- i. 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Reading
- j. 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Math
- k. High School Completion
- l. Higher Education
- m. Housing Affordability
- n. Homelessness
- o. Juvenile Arrests
- p. Adult Arrests
- q. Domestic Violence
- r. Gang Membership
- s. Youth Connectedness to School
- t. Poverty
- u. Unemployment
- v. Health Insurance

#### H. TIER 1: EVIDENCE BASED PRACTICE

Evidence-Based Practices are “gold standard” programs – those programs that have been empirically proven to produce positive outcomes and that are implemented in Sonoma County with fidelity to the model program.

1. **Evidence-based Clearinghouse:** A variety of evidence-based clearinghouses evaluate whether or not programs meet the criteria for being evidence-based. Generally, these clearinghouses use similar criteria: rigorous evaluation using experimental<sup>2</sup> design, publication in a peer-reviewed journal, sustained effect, replication and replicability. Often, these rigorous evaluations are completed by universities, government agencies, and privately funded research institutes. It is less common for a locality to have the necessary resources to complete this level of evaluation. In order to verify that Programs at Tier 1 have met the above criteria, the program submitted must be included in one or more of the evidence-based clearinghouses. Some programs listed on clearinghouses do not meet the criteria for Tier 1 placement, and may be placed on Tier 2 or Tier 3. See the “Upstream Clearinghouse Crosswalk” for a list of clearinghouses and the rating on each that meets the criteria for Tier 1. Evidence-based practices are popular with funders because there is a high likelihood that the initiative will work as intended.

---

<sup>2</sup> “The defining characteristic of experimental research designs is control (i.e., purposeful manipulation) of the independent variable(s). The strongest experimental designs also have random assignment of participants to treatment and control groups. In experiments, researchers do something to the research participants (they intervene, administer a treatment, or modify an environment), and they examine the results of this activity. They do not simply observe or ask questions. In a simple design, participants are randomly assigned to an experimental group or control group. Random assignment is crucial because it makes the groups equivalent (within the limits of probability) at the beginning of the experiment. It is also important that experimenters control the treatment so that they know its nature, size, and timing. The experimental group receives the treatment, and the control group does not; the researcher then determines if the groups differ on the dependent (outcome) variable.” (2009) “The SAGE Glossary of the Social and Behavioral Sciences.” SAGE Publications. Thousand Oaks, CA.

The following link provides a good discussion of evidence-based initiatives.

[http://www.uwex.edu/ces/flp/families/whatworks\\_06.pdf](http://www.uwex.edu/ces/flp/families/whatworks_06.pdf)

2. **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 model program in the following dimensions.<sup>3</sup>
  - a. **Adherence** - The extent to which the model's critical elements (core activities and methods necessary to achieve the outcomes desired) are implemented.
  - b. **Dose/exposure** - The amount of program content received by participants.
  - c. **Quality of program delivery** - The manner in which providers implement the program, relative to specifications in the model program.
  - d. **Participant responsiveness** - The extent to which participants are engaged by and involved in the activities and content of the program.

To demonstrate fidelity, submitters will use one of the following options.

- a. If the model program requires monitoring of fidelity – for instance by requiring an accreditation, licensing, review or audit process, then the submitting program will provide evidence of this.
  - b. If the model program does not monitor fidelity or monitoring is optional, then the submitting program will describe the activities to meet the above-listed dimensions of fidelity (a-d.).
3. **Adaptations:** Although discouraged, programs may sometimes make adaptations from the model program manual. Examples of acceptable and risky or unacceptable adaptations are as follows.<sup>4</sup>

#### **Acceptable Adaptations**

- a. Changing language – Translating and/or modifying vocabulary
- b. Replacing images to show youth and families that look like the target audience
- c. Replacing cultural references
- d. Modifying some aspects of activities such as physical contact
- e. Adding relevant, evidence-based content to make the program more appealing to participants

#### **Risky or Unacceptable Adaptations**

- a. Reducing the number or length of sessions or how long participants are involved
- b. Lowering the level of participant engagement
- c. Eliminating key messages or skills learned

---

<sup>3</sup> LFA Group: Learning for Action. (March, 2012 DRAFT). First 5 Sonoma County: Evaluation Plan for the Commission's 2011-15 Strategic Plan.

<sup>4</sup> Acceptable and risky or unacceptable adaptations mirror those articulated by First 5 Sonoma County.

- d. Removing topics
- e. Changing the theoretical approach
- f. Using staff or volunteers who are not adequately trained or qualified
- g. Using fewer staff members than recommended

Any adaptation made to the model program will be explained.

The following link provides a good discussion of evidence-based initiatives.

[http://whatworks.uwex.edu/attachment/whatworks\\_04.pdf](http://whatworks.uwex.edu/attachment/whatworks_04.pdf)

## I. TIER 2: PROMISING PRACTICE

Promising Practices do not meet the rigorous Tier 1 criteria for evidence-based practice but they are designed based on sound theory and with clear expected outcomes. Tier 2 programs meet the criteria listed below. The intent of Tier 2 is that program implementers use the evidence reflected in the literature review to inform the design of the logic model, manual and evaluation. To be considered a promising practice, it will be apparent that the logic model, manual and evaluation are all aligned and reflect the evidence cited in the literature review.

1. Literature Review: A literature review is a summary and synthesis of current and credible literature on a specific topic, issue, or practice method. It is a survey of scholarly articles, books and other sources that are relevant to the subject. A credible literature review includes the following components.<sup>5 6</sup>
  - a. Clear statement of the subject of interest.
  - b. Review of a credible number of studies about the topic. It should be clear that the most influential, most current, and most cited sources have been included.
  - c. Summary of what is known or not known about the topic.
  - d. Literature review was written within the past 15 years.

The following two articles provide good discussions of how to conduct and write a literature review:

[http://www.york.cuny.edu/~washton/student/Org-Behavior/lit\\_rev\\_eg.pdf](http://www.york.cuny.edu/~washton/student/Org-Behavior/lit_rev_eg.pdf)

<http://gsteinbe.intrasun.tcnj.edu/tcnj/rhetoric2/litreviews.htm>

2. Logic Model: A logic model is a map or simple illustration of what a program does, what the program hopes to achieve, and how the program will measure achievement. A credible logic model will include most, if not all, of the following elements.<sup>7</sup> A template is available at:

[www.SonomaUpstream.org](http://www.SonomaUpstream.org)

---

<sup>5</sup> The Writing Center, University of North Carolina.

<sup>6</sup> Rubin & Perrish (2008).

<sup>7</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children & Families, as cited on [www.childwelfare.gov/management/effectiveness/logic\\_model.cfm#whatis](http://www.childwelfare.gov/management/effectiveness/logic_model.cfm#whatis).

- a. Problem Statement (a.k.a. Problems to be solved)
- b. Inputs (a.k.a. Resources)
- c. Outputs (a.k.a. Activities, Participation)
- d. Outcomes (a.k.a. Impacts, Results)
- e. Assumptions/Theories
- f. Environmental Factors

The following sites offer clear and easy to use assistance in developing a logic model.

<http://www.childwelfare.gov/management/effectiveness/models.cfm>

<http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicbiblio.html>

[http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cse/grants/resources/logic\\_model/](http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cse/grants/resources/logic_model/)

3. Manual: The program has a book, 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. A credible manual includes most, if not all, of the following components.

- a. Description of the program
  - i. History of the program
  - ii. Rationale
  - iii. Core components of the program
  - iv. Definitions
  - v. Assumptions
- b. Staff
  - i. Background and Education
  - ii. Licensure
  - iii. Background checks
  - iv. Job description
  - v. Responsibilities
  - vi. Training
  - vii. Supervision
  - viii. Performance evaluation
- c. Clients
  - i. Outreach methods
  - ii. Eligibility criteria (i.e.; age, income, location)
  - iii. Enrollment process
  - iv. Client : Staff ratio
  - v. Rights and Responsibilities
  - vi. Complaints and Appeals
  - vii. Crisis management
  - viii. Termination process

- d. Curricula / Activities
  - i. Components / Content
  - ii. Number of sessions
  - iii. Sequence
  - iv. Quality management
  - v. Fidelity requirements
- e. Records
  - i. Information to document
  - ii. Confidentiality
  - iii. Records retention
- f. Evaluation
  - i. Research question to be answered
  - ii. Data to be collected
  - iii. Analysis and reporting procedures
  - iv. Audiences

The following links provide examples of a manual for an evidence-based practice.

<http://www.schoolcounselor.org/files/Texas.pdf>

<http://www.ocfs.state.ny.us/main/b2h/manual/B2H%20Program%20Manual%202001-2012.pdf>

<http://www.ybhandbooks.org/files/tools/DOL-YB-ProgramManual.pdf>

4. **Evaluation:** Good evaluations assess performance, measure impacts on families and communities, and document successes. With evaluation information, programs are able to direct limited resources to where they are most needed and most effective for their clients and communities. The evaluation should suggest positive outcomes and reflect the design of the program being submitted. A credible evaluation will result in a report that includes all of the following components.

- a. **PURPOSE:** Reason(s) that the evaluation was conducted.
- b. **AUDIENCE:** Intended audience and their information or decision making needs.
- c. **QUESTIONS:** Research questions that the evaluation answered.
- d. **LITERATURE REVIEW:** A review of the literature that informed the development of the program and the evaluation.
- e. **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.
- f. **ANALYSIS:** Appropriate descriptive and inferential analysis.
- g. **RECOMMENDATIONS:** Discussion of the analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.

The following site is a program evaluation workbook focused on family centered services.

[http://cfrc.illinois.edu/pubs/rp\\_20000614\\_ElementsOfBestPracticeInFamilyCenteredServices.pdf](http://cfrc.illinois.edu/pubs/rp_20000614_ElementsOfBestPracticeInFamilyCenteredServices.pdf)

Frequently cited authors who write about evaluation are Joseph Wholey, Michael Scriven, Emil Posovac, Raymond G. Carey, Carol H. Weiss, Egon Guba, and Michael Quinn Patton. Publications by any of these authors are useful.

5. **Cohorts:** To be considered a promising practice, a program will have been delivered to more than one cohort. In other words, the program is no longer considered a pilot test. A cohort is a group of clients that has received the same program services within a given period—usually the time frame selected for one evaluation (Clients within a cohort may have received services over time and not all at exactly the same time) Clients within a cohort may have different demographics.

## J. TIER 3: EMERGING PRACTICE

Emerging practices have the intent of being outcomes-based and meet the prerequisites for evidence-based practice. However, these programs have not yet conducted or completed an evaluation. Tier 3 programs must meet the criteria listed below. The intent of Tier 3 is that program implementers use the evidence reflected in the literature review to inform the design of the logic model, policy and procedures and evaluation plan. To be considered an emerging practice, it will be apparent that the logic model, policy and procedures and evaluation plan are all aligned and reflect the evidence cited in the literature review.

1. **Literature Review:** A literature review is a summary and synthesis of current and credible literature on a specific topic, issue, or practice method. It is a survey of scholarly articles, books and other sources that are relevant to the subject. A credible literature review includes the following components.<sup>8 9</sup>
  - a. Clear statement of the subject of interest.
  - b. Review of a credible number of studies about the topic. It should be clear that the most influential, most current, and most cited sources have been included.
  - c. Summary of what is known or not known about the topic.
  - d. Literature review was written within the past 15 years.

The following two articles provide good discussions of how to conduct and write a literature review:

[http://www.york.cuny.edu/~washton/student/Org-Behavior/lit\\_rev\\_eg.pdf](http://www.york.cuny.edu/~washton/student/Org-Behavior/lit_rev_eg.pdf)  
<http://gsteinbe.intrasun.tcnj.edu/tcnj/rhetoric2/litreviews.htm>

2. **Logic Model:** A logic model is a map or simple illustration of what a program does, what the program hopes to achieve, and how the program will measure achievement. A credible logic model will include most, if not all, of the following elements.<sup>10</sup> A template is available at [www.SonomaUpstream.org](http://www.SonomaUpstream.org)

---

<sup>8</sup> The Writing Center, University of North Carolina.

<sup>9</sup> Rubin & Perrish (2008).

<sup>10</sup> U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Administration for Children & Families, as cited on [www.childwelfare.gov/management/effectiveness/logic\\_model.cfm#whatis](http://www.childwelfare.gov/management/effectiveness/logic_model.cfm#whatis).

- a. Problem Statement (a.k.a. problems to be solved)
- b. Inputs (a.k.a. Resources)
- c. Outputs (a.k.a. Activities, Participation)
- d. Outcomes (a.k.a. Impacts, Results)
- e. Assumptions/Theories
- f. Environmental Factors

The following sites offer clear and easy to use assistance in developing a logic model.

<http://www.childwelfare.gov/management/effectiveness/models.cfm>

<http://www.uwex.edu/ces/pdande/evaluation/evallogicbiblio.html>

[http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cse/grants/resources/logic\\_model/](http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/cse/grants/resources/logic_model/)

3. Policies and Procedures: The program may not have a fully developed manual but has made progress towards standardization through the development of policies and procedures. A policy states the expectations. A procedure describes the steps to meet the expectations. Policies and procedures also describe what not to do.
  
4. Evaluation Plan: Good program evaluations assess performance, measure impacts on families and communities, and document successes. With evaluation information, programs are able to direct limited resources to where they are most needed and most effective for their clients and communities. Tier 3 programs may not have a completed evaluation but are conducting or have a plan to conduct, an evaluation. Programs can remain on Tier 3 for up to three years after the development of an evaluation plan. After three years, if the evaluation has not been completed, the program will no longer qualify for Tier 3. A credible evaluation plan will include all of the following components.
  - a. PURPOSE: Reason(s) that the evaluation is being conducted.
  - b. AUDIENCE: Intended audience and their information or decision making needs.
  - c. QUESTIONS: Research questions that the evaluation will answer.
  - d. RESOURCES: Resources needed and available for the evaluation, including timelines.
  - e. CHALLENGES: Anticipated challenges to completing the evaluation and how they will be managed.
  - f. LITERATURE REVIEW: A review of the literature that will inform the evaluation decision.
  - g. 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.
  - h. ANALYSIS: Plan for appropriate descriptive and inferential analysis.
  - i. RECOMMENDATIONS: Plan for the creation of conclusions and recommendations.
  - j. DISSEMINATION: Plan that identifies when and how to disseminate the report and to what audiences.

The following site is a program evaluation workbook focused on family centered services.

[http://www.cfrc.illinois.edu/publications/rp\\_20000614\\_ElementsOfBestPracticeInFamilyCenteredServices.pdf](http://www.cfrc.illinois.edu/publications/rp_20000614_ElementsOfBestPracticeInFamilyCenteredServices.pdf)

Frequently cited authors who write about evaluation are Joseph Wholey, Michael Scriven, Emil Posovac, Raymond G. Carey, Carol H. Weiss, Egon Guba, and Michael Quinn Patton. Publications by any of these authors are useful.





# UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

## Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Application Form: PREREQUISITES

Program Name \_\_\_\_\_

Organization \_\_\_\_\_

**INSTRUCTIONS:** To apply to the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs, submit this application, the Program Description application, and one Tier application with the requested attachments to [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org) or mail to Upstream, 3600 Westwind Blvd., Santa Rosa, CA 95403. Complete ALL sections. Detailed information about each question is available in the separate INSTRUCTIONS. Assistance in completing this application is available and encouraged. Call Upstream at 565-5800 to indicate your intent to submit this form and to receive assistance.

All programs that are included in the Upstream Portfolio will meet the following four prerequisites.

**1. Prevention Focused: Which prevention-focused category or categories does this program fit?**

(check all that apply)

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. To meet this prerequisite, a program will provide services in one or more of the following categories:

- \_\_\_\_\_ a. Health promotion (for example: alcohol and drug prevention, mental health, pre-natal, family planning and teen pregnancy reduction)
- \_\_\_\_\_ b. Education (for example: child care, preschool, K-12)
- \_\_\_\_\_ c. Community development (for example: economic development, parks and recreation)
- \_\_\_\_\_ d. Family support (for example: family interventions, parenting support, fatherhood)
- \_\_\_\_\_ e. Financial literacy
- \_\_\_\_\_ f. Health care and insurance
- \_\_\_\_\_ g. Criminal diversion programs (including first-time juvenile and adult offenders)
- \_\_\_\_\_ h. Life skills (for example: job skills, job readiness, civic involvement, volunteering)
- \_\_\_\_\_ i. One stop centers (for example: Family Justice Center, Job Link)
- \_\_\_\_\_ j. Geographically targeted (for example: Roseland Community Action Zone)
- \_\_\_\_\_ k. Programs and strategies that mitigate or improve negative peer influences and/or improve resiliency (for example: mentoring, gang prevention)
- \_\_\_\_\_ l. Violence prevention (for example: domestic violence, child abuse and neglect)
- \_\_\_\_\_ m. Basic needs (for example: shelter, food)
- \_\_\_\_\_ n. Programs that target early system entrants (for example: programs that are designed for individuals who use any County service for the first time)
- \_\_\_\_\_ o. Other (please describe)

For a full description, refer to the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs: INSTRUCTIONS

Submit this form to [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org) or 707.565.5800 or mail to Upstream, 3600 Westwind Blvd., Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Portfolio of Upstream Programs: **Application Form: Pre-Requisites (Revised 7.12.13)**

Page 1

**2. Factors Addressed: Which of the following factors does this program address?** (check all that apply)

The Upstream Investment Policy Committee has determined that nine factors contribute to downstream need for services. These factors are well documented, consistent, and generally evident early in a child’s life. These factors are fully described in *Upstream Investments* (January 11, 2010), pages 8-32. To meet this prerequisite, programs will provide services that address one or more of the following factors:

- a. Poverty
- b. Racial and ethnic disparities
- c. Community conditions
- d. Public opinion, public policy and laws
- e. Family dysfunction
- f. Negative peer influences
- g. Early antisocial behavior
- h. Substance abuse
- i. Academic concerns

**Local Relevancy: Which of the following collaboratives does this program address?** (check all that apply)

In Sonoma County, several community-wide collaborations have identified widely held and promoted values and indicators of success that reflect upstream investments. Programs and strategies included in this Upstream Portfolio will target priorities and indicators of success promoted by one or more community-wide collaborations. Including local relevancy in evidence-based practice is sometimes referred to as “value-driven evidence-based practice.” To meet this prerequisite, programs will provide services that fit with the values of one or more of the following community collaboratives:

- a. Upstream Investments
- b. Health Action
- c. Innovation Council
- d. First 5
- e. Measure O Mayor’s Gang Prevention Task Force
- f. Child Care Planning Council
- g. Continuum of Care
- h. Cradle to Career
- i. Aiming High Consortium
- j. Community Health Needs Assessment
- k. County of Sonoma Strategic Plan
- l. Mental Health Services Act
- m. Partnership for Children
- n. Prevent Child Abuse Sonoma
- o. Sonoma County BEST
- p. Other (please list \_\_\_\_\_)

**4. Indicators Addressed: Which of the following indicator(s) does this program address?** (check all that apply)

The Upstream Investments Policy promotes a shared commitment to achieving community outcomes. Part of participating in Upstream is committing to implement programs that positively effect these outcomes:

- a. Child Maltreatment
- b. Youth Binge Drinking
- c. Youth Drug Use
- d. Youth Depression
- e. Youth Tobacco Use
- f. Teen Birth
- g. Obesity
- h. Pre-School Attendance
- i. 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Reading
- j. 3<sup>rd</sup> Grade Math
- k. High School Completion
- l. Higher Education
- m. Housing Affordability
- n. Homelessness
- o. Juvenile Arrests
- p. Adult Arrests
- q. Domestic Violence
- r. Gang Membership
- s. Youth Connectedness to School
- t. Poverty
- u. Unemployment
- v. Health Insurance

For a full description, refer to the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs: INSTRUCTIONS

Submit this form to [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org) or 707.565.5800 or mail to Upstream, 3600 Westwind Blvd., Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Portfolio of Upstream Programs: **Application Form: Pre-Requisites (Revised 7.12.13)**



# UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

## Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Application Form: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

**INSTRUCTIONS:** To apply to the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs, submit this application, the Pre-Requisite application, and one Tier application with the requested attachments to [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org) or mail to Upstream, 3600 Westwind Blvd., Santa Rosa, CA 95403. Complete ALL sections. Detailed information about each question is available in the separate INSTRUCTIONS. Assistance in completing this application is available and encouraged. Call Upstream at 565-5800 to indicate your intent to submit this form and to receive assistance.

1. **Program Name** \_\_\_\_\_

2. **Organization** \_\_\_\_\_

3. **Contact name** \_\_\_\_\_

4. **Contact phone number** \_\_\_\_\_

5. **Contact e-mail address** \_\_\_\_\_

6. **Program website (if one exists)** \_\_\_\_\_

7. **Program Design:** Provide a program description that includes the following or similar elements: goals, strategies/activities, target population, outreach strategies and anticipated outcomes (anticipated benefit to client, county, society). The program description should be based on the program's logic model; clearly reflect the findings from the literature review; align with the content of the program's manual (for Tier 2) or policy and procedures document (for Tier 3); and incorporate the evaluation outcomes (for Tier 2) or elements of the evaluation design (for Tier 3).

For a full description, refer to the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs: INSTRUCTIONS

Submit this form to [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org) or 707.565.5800 or mail to Upstream, 3600 Westwind Blvd., Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Portfolio of Upstream Programs: **Application Form: Program Description (Revised 7.12.13)**

Page 1

**8. Program service location(s):**

(a) List all locations in Sonoma County where this program is physically provided to clients:

(b) Identify the Supervisorial District for each location (if known):

**Supervisorial District(s):** Check all Districts where services are physically provided

\_\_\_\_\_ 1<sup>st</sup> District (Susan Gorin)

\_\_\_\_\_ 4<sup>th</sup> District (Mike McGuire)

\_\_\_\_\_ 2<sup>nd</sup> District (David Rabbitt)

\_\_\_\_\_ 5<sup>th</sup> District (Efren Carrillo)

\_\_\_\_\_ 3<sup>rd</sup> District (Shirlee Zane)

**9. Clients:** Describe the number of and demographics of clients in the most recent fiscal year. It is acceptable and encouraged to cut and paste from a report prepared for another purpose:

**10. Implementers:** Please list all organization(s) who are implementing this program under this application:

**11. Funding source(s)/Budget:**

a) Provide total current fiscal year program budget amount (details not necessary) under this application:

b) Provide a list of all funders for this program under this application in the most recent fiscal year:

For a full description, refer to the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs: INSTRUCTIONS

Submit this form to [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org) or 707.565.5800 or mail to Upstream, 3600 Westwind Blvd., Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Portfolio of Upstream Programs: **Application Form: Program Description (Revised 6.12.12)**



# 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 \_\_\_\_\_

This is a \_\_\_\_\_ 1<sup>st</sup> time application \_\_\_\_\_ renewal application

1. **Evidence-based Clearinghouse:** Which of the following clearinghouses include 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.

- \_\_\_\_\_ [Administration on Aging](#)
- \_\_\_\_\_ [American Diabetes Association](#)
- \_\_\_\_\_ [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 Fidelity\*: How is the program implemented in Sonoma County with fidelity to the model program?**

	Required by model program (please provide detailed description)	How you meet model program requirements (please provide detailed description)
Adherence		

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

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](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org) - 707.565.5800 or mail to Upstream, 3600 Westwind Blvd., Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Portfolio of Upstream Programs: **Application Form: TIER 1 (Revised 7.12.13)**



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?  
(Please provide specific detailed information.)

For a full description of TIER 1, refer to the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs: INSTRUCTIONS

Submit this form to [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org) - 707.565.5800 or mail to Upstream, 3600 Westwind Blvd., Santa Rosa, CA 95403

Portfolio of Upstream Programs: **Application Form: TIER 1 (Revised 7.12.13)**



# UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

## Application to Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs SCORING SHEET: TIER 1

Date Due: \_\_\_\_\_ Possible Committee Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Program Name and Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

**Program Description and Prerequisites are acceptable. Please review and rate the following.**

Do you have a conflict of interest? .....  No  Yes

Please state the conflict and immediately contact portfolio staff.

1. Is the entry on the **evidence-based** Clearinghouse acceptable? .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
2. Is the evidence of implementing in Sonoma County with **fidelity acceptable**?  No  Yes
  - a. Adherence .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - b. Dose/exposure .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - c. Quality of program delivery.....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - d. Participant responsiveness .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
3. Are there **adaptations** to the model program? .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - a. Are the **adaptations** to the model **acceptable**? .....  No  Yes

**Reviewer Recommendation:**

- a. Do the program design and fidelity practices meet our expectations for evidence based practice? .....  No  Yes
- b. Do you recommend Tier 1? .....  No  Yes
- c. Please explain your decision (comments will be provided to the submitting organization)



# UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

## Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Application Form: TIER 2

Program Name \_\_\_\_\_

Organization \_\_\_\_\_

This is a \_\_\_\_\_ 1<sup>st</sup> time application \_\_\_\_\_ renewal application

1. **Literature Review:** Attach the literature review.
2. **Logic Model:** Attach the logic model.
3. **Manual:** If reasonable, attach the manual. If the manual is not electronic, attach a table of contents. You may be asked to provide more.
4. **Evaluation:** Attach the evaluation report.
5. **Cohorts:** Identify at least 2 cohorts. (include dates, services provided, locations and # of clients)



# UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

## Application to Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs SCORING SHEET: TIER 2

Date Due: \_\_\_\_\_ Possible Committee Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Program Name and Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

**Program Description and Prerequisites are acceptable. Please review and rate the following.**

Do you have a conflict of interest? .....  No  Yes

Please state the conflict and immediately contact portfolio staff

1. Is the **Literature Review** acceptable?.....  No  Yes
  - a. Clear statement of the subject of interest.....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - b. Credible number of studies about the topic .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - c. Summary of what is known or not known about the topic .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - d. Written within the past 15 years .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  
2. Is the **Logic Model** acceptable?.....  No  Yes
  - a. Problem Statement (a.k.a. Problems to be solved) .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - b. Inputs (a.k.a. Resources) .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - c. Outputs (a.k.a. Activities, Participation).....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - d. Outcomes (a.k.a. Impacts, Results).....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - e. Assumptions /Theories .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - f. Environmental Factors.....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  
3. Is the **Manual** acceptable? .....  No  Yes
  - a. Description of the program .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - b. Staff .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - c. Clients .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - d. Curricula / Activities.....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - e. Records .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - f. Evaluation.....  No  Yes  Not Clear

For more information visit [www.SonomaUpstream.org](http://www.SonomaUpstream.org), contact [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org), or call 565.5800.

4. Is the **Evaluation** acceptable? ..... No Yes
- a. Purpose ..... No Yes Not Clear
- b. Audience..... No Yes Not Clear
- c. Questions..... No Yes Not Clear
- d. Literature Review ..... No Yes Not Clear
- e. Methods..... No Yes Not Clear
- f. Analysis..... No Yes Not Clear
- g. Recommendations ..... No Yes Not Clear
- h. Are the outcomes suggested by the evaluation acceptable?..... No Yes Not Clear

5. Is the evidence of more than one **Cohort** acceptable? ..... No Yes

**Reviewer Recommendation:**

- a. Do the logic model, manual and evaluation reflect the research cited in the literature review? ..... No Yes
- b. Do you recommend Tier 2? ..... No Yes
- c. Please explain your decision (comments will be provided to the submitting organization)

For more information visit [www.SonomaUpstream.org](http://www.SonomaUpstream.org), contact [Info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:Info@SonomaUpstream.org), or call 565.5800.



# UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

## Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Application Form: TIER 3

Program Name \_\_\_\_\_

Organization \_\_\_\_\_

This is a \_\_\_\_\_ 1<sup>st</sup> time application \_\_\_\_\_ renewal application

1. **Literature Review:** Attach the literature review.
2. **Logic Model:** Attach the logic model.
3. **Policy & Procedures:** Attach the policy and procedures.
4. **Evaluation Plan:** Attach the evaluation plan.



# UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

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

## Application to Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs SCORING SHEET: TIER 3

Date Due: \_\_\_\_\_ Possible Committee Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Reviewer's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Program Name and Organization: \_\_\_\_\_

Date Reviewed: \_\_\_\_\_

**Program Description and Prerequisites are acceptable. Please review and rate the following.**

Do you have a conflict of interest? .....  No  Yes

Please state the conflict and immediately contact portfolio staff

1. Is the **Literature Review** acceptable? .....  No  Yes
  - a. Clear statement of the subject of interest .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - b. Credible number of studies about the topic .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - c. Summary of what is known or not known about the topic .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - d. Written within the past 15 years .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  
2. Is the **Logic Model** acceptable? .....  No  Yes
  - a. Problem Statement (a.k.a. Problems to be solved) .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - b. Inputs (a.k.a. Resources) .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - c. Outputs (a.k.a. Activities, Participation) .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - d. Outcomes (a.k.a. Impacts, Results) .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - e. Assumptions /Theories .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - f. Environmental Factors .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  
3. Are the **Policies and Procedures** acceptable? .....  No  Yes
  - a. Are basic expectations stated? .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - a. Are basic steps to meet the expectation described? .....  No  Yes  Not Clear
  - b. Is information about what not to do included? .....  No  Yes  Not Clear

4. Is the **Evaluation Plan** acceptable? ..... No Yes
- a. Intended Purpose ..... No Yes Not Clear
- b. Audience..... No Yes Not Clear
- c. Questions..... No Yes Not Clear
- d. Resources..... No Yes Not Clear
- e. Challenges ..... No Yes Not Clear
- f. Literature Review..... No Yes Not Clear
- g. Methods..... No Yes Not Clear
- h. Analysis..... No Yes Not Clear
- i. Recommendations..... No Yes Not Clear
- j. Dissemination ..... No Yes Not Clear
- k. Is the evaluation expected to be complete in 3 years? ..... No Yes Not Clear

**Reviewer Recommendation:**

- a. Do the logic model, policy and procedures and evaluation plan reflect the research cited in the literature review? ..... No Yes
- b. Do you recommend Tier 3? ..... No Yes
- c. Please explain your decision (comments will be provided to the submitting organization)





Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs

## ACCEPTABLE CLEARINGHOUSES

Tier 1 of the Portfolio of Model Upstream programs requires that a program be listed on an evidence-based clearinghouse and implemented with fidelity in Sonoma County. This document includes the allowable clearinghouses and the ratings on each clearinghouse that correspond to the Portfolio Tiers. New clearinghouses are added as they become known to the Portfolio Review Committee. To request that a clearinghouse be reviewed for inclusion here, send a request to [info@SonomaUpstream.org](mailto:info@SonomaUpstream.org). Portfolio Review Committee reviewers who make the recommendations for Tier placement use this list.

Clearinghouse	Clearinghouse Requirements				Match to Portfolio Tier 1
	1 quasi or experimental evaluation	Peer reviewed	Replicated	Replicable	
1. Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence Blueprints <a href="http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/index.html">http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/index.html</a>	Yes	Yes	Yes for Model Programs, No for Promising Programs	No	Model Program
2. SAMHSA National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices (NREPP) <a href="http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/">http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/</a>	See Notes Below	See Notes Below	See Notes Below	See Notes Below	Any program listed that meet the levels described below EXCEPT Legacy Programs
3. Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Model Program Guide <a href="http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/">http://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/</a>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Exemplary Effective

Clearinghouse	Clearinghouse Requirements				Match to Portfolio Tier 1
	1 quasi or experimental evaluation	Peer reviewed	Replicated	Replicable	
4. Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy, Social Programs that Work <a href="http://www.toptierevidence.org">www.toptierevidence.org</a>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Top Tier
5. What Works Clearinghouse <a href="http://www.ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/">www.ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/</a>	Yes	Y/N	Yes for Meets Evidence Standards with medium/large extent, No for small extent	No	Meets Evidence Standards (including with reservations) AND medium to large extent of evidence
6. California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse for Child Welfare <a href="http://www.cebc4cw.org/">www.cebc4cw.org/</a>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	1-Well-Supported 2-Supported 3-Promising
7. Guide to Community Preventive Services <a href="http://www.thecommunityguide.org">www.thecommunityguide.org</a>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Recommended
8. Child Trends LINKS Database <a href="http://www.childtrends.org/Links/">www.childtrends.org/Links/</a>	Yes	Yes	Maybe	Maybe	Any program included if replication and replicability are included in description
9. Diffusion of Effective Behavioral Interventions – DEBI <a href="http://www.effectiveinterventions.org/en/home.aspx">www.effectiveinterventions.org/en/home.aspx</a>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Any program
10. American Diabetes Association Education Recognition Program <a href="http://professional.diabetes.org/Recognition.aspx?typ=15&amp;cid=84040">http://professional.diabetes.org/Recognition.aspx?typ=15&amp;cid=84040</a>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Any program listed in Education Recognition Program and listed in Sonoma County

Clearinghouse	Clearinghouse Requirements				Match to Portfolio Tier 1
	1 quasi or experimental evaluation	Peer reviewed	Replicated	Replicable	
11. Administration on Aging <a href="http://www.healthyagingprograms.org/content.asp?sectionid=32">http://www.healthyagingprograms.org/content.asp?sectionid=32</a>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Programs listed as evidence-based by AoA under its Evidence-Based Disease and Disability Prevention Program.
12. Cochrane Collaboration Library of Systematic Reviews <a href="http://www.thecochranelibrary.com/view/0/index.html">http://www.thecochranelibrary.com/view/0/index.html</a>	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	High quality evidence for outcomes targeted by applicant program

**NOTES**

- No evidence of harm is also required as a requirement for all sites. All sites use this criteria so in the interest of space it is not included above.
- Peer review may be evidenced by publication in a peer reviewed journal or peer review by the clearinghouse reviewers.
- Upstream Investments originally included a requirement for sustained effect of at least 6 months. However, this criteria is not yet universally accepted by all clearinghouses. Therefore, this criteria is not currently required for a clearinghouse to be acceptable.
- The most common evidence of replicability is an implementation manual. Some programs and initiatives however do not reasonably have a manual. These programs are invited to provide their own evidence of replicability that will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis by the reviewers.
- Not all clearinghouses included evidence of replicability in their reviews.

P

- SAMSHA NREPP reviews programs and reports the review findings. It lists all programs reviewed. For Upstream the SAMHSA NREPP review must include the following:

Quality of Research (all 6 required)

**1. Reliability of Measures**

Outcome measures should have acceptable reliability to be interpretable. "Acceptable" here means reliability at a level that is conventionally accepted by experts in the field.

0 = Absence of evidence of reliability or evidence that some relevant types of reliability (e.g., test-retest, interrater, interitem) did not reach acceptable levels.

2 = All relevant types of reliability have been documented to be at acceptable levels in studies by the applicant.

4 = All relevant types of reliability have been documented to be at acceptable levels in studies by independent investigators.

**For placement on the Upstream Portfolio, a program must be rated by NREPP as 2 or 4 for Reliability of Measures.**

**2. Validity of Measures**

Outcome measures should have acceptable validity to be interpretable. "Acceptable" here means validity at a level that is conventionally accepted by experts in the field.

0 = Absence of evidence of measure validity, or some evidence that the measure is not valid.

2 = Measure has face validity; absence of evidence that measure is not valid.

4 = Measure has one or more acceptable forms of criterion-related validity (correlation with appropriate, validated measures or objective criteria); OR, for objective measures of response, there are procedural checks to confirm data validity; absence of evidence that measure is not valid.

**For placement on the Upstream Portfolio, a program must be rated by NREPP as 2 or 4 for Validity of Measures.**

**3. Intervention Fidelity**

The "experimental" intervention implemented in a study should have fidelity to the intervention proposed by the applicant. Instruments that have tested acceptable psychometric properties (e.g., inter-rater reliability, validity as shown by positive association with outcomes) provide the highest level of evidence.

0 = Absence of evidence or only narrative evidence that the applicant or provider believes the intervention was implemented with acceptable fidelity.

2 = There is evidence of acceptable fidelity in the form of judgment(s) by experts, systematic collection of data (e.g., dosage, time spent in training, adherence to guidelines or a manual), or a fidelity measure with unspecified or unknown psychometric properties.

4 = There is evidence of acceptable fidelity from a tested fidelity instrument shown to have reliability and validity.

**For placement on the Upstream Portfolio, a program must be rated by NREPP as 2 or 4 for Intervention Fidelity.**

#### 4. Missing Data and Attrition

Study results can be biased by participant attrition and other forms of missing data. Statistical methods as supported by theory and research can be employed to control for missing data and attrition that would bias results, but studies with no attrition or missing data needing adjustment provide the strongest evidence that results are not biased.

0 = Missing data and attrition were taken into account inadequately, OR there was too much to control for bias.

2 = Missing data and attrition were taken into account by simple estimates of data and observations, or by demonstrations of similarity between remaining participants and those lost to attrition.

4 = Missing data and attrition were taken into account by more sophisticated methods that model missing data, observations, or participants, OR there were no attrition or missing data needing adjustment.

**For placement on the Upstream Portfolio, a program must be rated by NREPP as 2 or 4 for Missing Data and Attrition.**

#### 5. Potential Confounding Variables

Often variables other than the intervention may account for the reported outcomes. The degree to which confounds are accounted for affects the strength of causal inference.

0 = Confounding variables or factors were as likely to account for the outcome(s) reported as were the hypothesized causes.

2 = One or more potential confounding variables or factors were not completely addressed, but the intervention appears more likely than these confounding factors to account for the outcome(s) reported.

4 = All known potential confounding variables appear to have been completely addressed in order to allow causal inference between the intervention and outcome(s) reported.

**For placement on the Upstream Portfolio, a program must be rated by NREPP as 2 or 4 for Potential Confounding Variables.**

#### 6. Appropriateness of Analysis

Appropriate analysis is necessary to make an inference that an intervention caused reported outcomes.

0 = Analyses were not appropriate for inferring relationships between intervention and outcome, OR sample size was inadequate.

2 = Some analyses may not have been appropriate for inferring relationships between intervention and outcome, OR sample size may have been inadequate.

4 = Analyses were appropriate for inferring relationships between intervention and outcome. Sample size and power were adequate.

**For placement on the Upstream Portfolio, a program must be rated by NREPP 4 for Intervention Appropriateness of Analysis.**

Readiness for Dissemination (all 3 required)

**1. Availability of Implementation Materials**

(e.g., treatment manuals, brochures, information for administrators)

0 = No materials or resources are available that could assist with program implementation.

1 = Limited materials and resources are available that could facilitate but not directly assist with program implementation.

2 = Limited materials and resources are available that directly assist with program implementation.

3 = Adequate materials and resources are available that directly assist with program implementation.

4 = Adequate materials and resources are available that directly assist with program implementation, and they are of high quality and appropriate for the intended audience(s).

**For placement on the Upstream Portfolio, a program must be rated by NREPP 3 or 4 for Availability of Implementation Materials.**

**2. Availability of Training and Support Resources**

(e.g., tested training curricula, mechanisms for ongoing supervision and consultation)

0 = No materials, resources, and/or technical assistance are available that support training or coaching.

1 = Limited materials, resources, and/or technical assistance are available that could facilitate but not directly support training and coaching.

2 = Limited materials, resources, and/or technical assistance are available to directly support training and coaching.

3 = Adequate materials, resources, and/or technical assistance are available that directly support training and coaching.

4 = Adequate materials, resources, and technical assistance are available that directly support training and coaching, and they are of high quality and appropriate for the intended audience(s).

**For placement on the Upstream Portfolio, a program must be rated by NREPP 3 or 4 for Availability of Training and Support Resources.**

**3. Availability of Quality Assurance Procedures**

(e.g., protocols for gathering process and/or outcome data, ongoing monitoring of intervention fidelity, supervision/training feedback)

0 = No materials, resources, and/or procedures are available that could help ensure quality assurance.

1 = Limited materials, resources, and/or procedures are available that could facilitate but not directly assist in ensuring quality assurance.

2 = Limited materials, resources, and/or procedures are available to directly support quality assurance.

3 = Adequate materials, resources, and/or procedures are available that directly support quality assurance.

4 = Adequate materials, resources and/or procedures are available that directly support quality assurance, and they are of high quality and appropriate for the intended audience(s).

**For placement on the Upstream Portfolio, a program must be rated by NREPP 3 or 4 for Availability of Quality Assurance Procedures.**

The following clearinghouses have been considered by the Portfolio Review Committee and have been determined to not meet the Upstream criteria. Therefore, these clearinghouses are not acceptable for Portfolio placement.

Clearinghouse	Clearinghouse Requirements				Notes
	1 quasi or experimental evaluation	Peer reviewed	Replicated	Replicable	
1. Strengthening America's Families Effective Family Programs for Prevention of Delinquency <a href="http://www.strengtheningfamilies.org/html/model_programs.html">www.strengtheningfamilies.org/html/model_programs.html</a>	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>All reviews done in 1997 and 1999. Too old. No information about review panel and extent to which it meets criteria for "peer review."</li> </ul>
2. Promising Practices Network Programs that Work <a href="http://www.promisingpractices.net/programs.asp">www.promisingpractices.net/programs.asp</a>	Yes	No	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review process does not meet enough of the Upstream criteria for "evidence-based."</li> </ul>
3. Interagency Working Group on Youth Programs <a href="http://www.findyouthinfo.gov/ProgramSearch.aspx">www.findyouthinfo.gov/ProgramSearch.aspx</a>	Yes	Yes	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programs are assessed by an external review panel and reviews are completed by Development Services Group.</li> <li>Does not include enough of the Upstream requirements for "evidence-based."</li> </ul>
4. National Center for Mental Health Promotion and Youth Violence Prevention <a href="http://www.promoteprevent.org">www.promoteprevent.org</a>	No	No	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This site provides training and technical assistance for grantees funded by the U.S. Departments of Education, Justice, Health and Human Services, and SAMHSA. This site does not independently review programs for evidence-base. It uses the SAMHSA site for this.</li> </ul>

Clearinghouse	Clearinghouse Requirements				Notes
	1 quasi or experimental evaluation	Peer reviewed	Replicated	Replicable	
5. WestEd <a href="http://www.wested.org">www.wested.org</a>	No	No	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WestEd conducts evaluative research which may include experimental or quasi-experimental design but they do not review and rate others' evaluations.</li> <li>They provide program development, technical assistance and policy analysis related to education.</li> </ul>
6. Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning <a href="http://www.casel.org">www.casel.org</a>	No	No	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>CASEL conducts evaluative research (including some meta-analysis) but they do not review and rate others' evaluations.</li> </ul>
7. Healthy Sonoma Promising Practices <a href="http://www.healthysonoma.org">http://www.healthysonoma.org</a>	No	No	No	No	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>HealthySonoma does not make their own determinations about programs.</li> </ul>



**Portfolio of Model Upstream Investments: Renewal Process Draft Recommendations**  
*Developed by B.J. Bischoff based on feedback from the 7/17/13 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting*

**Drafted August 13, 2013**

**Renewal Process for Programs Currently Approved as Tier 1**

1. An organization with a program that is approved on the Portfolio of Upstream Programs as Tier 1 has three years from the date of approval to submit a new Tier 1 Application for this program, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the new Tier 1 submission.
2. All organizations with approved Tier 1 programs will receive emailed notices regarding the date their programs will expire as approved Tier 1 Portfolio Programs, the policies regarding renewal, and specific types of technical assistance available to help them submit a new Tier 1 Portfolio Application. These email notices will be sent 24, 12, 6, and 3 months prior to a program's expiration date.
3. Organizations submitting a Tier 1 program for renewal should check the *Renewal* box at the top of the Tier 1 Application Form. All other information in the Tier 1 renewal application may either be copied from the original Tier 1 approved application or updated to reflect changes in the program's fidelity and adaptations. All Tier 1 program renewal applications will be evaluated by the Portfolio Review Committee according to the approved procedures that are in place at the time of the Tier 1 renewal application.
4. If within three years of an organization having an approved Tier 1 Portfolio program, the Clearinghouse that originally included the program drops the program from its approved list, then the organization will be able to submit a Tier 2 Application for the program, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the new Tier 2 submission. All new Tier 2 program applications will be evaluated by the Portfolio Review Committee according to the approved procedures that are in place at the time of the Tier 2 application.
5. If within three years of having an approved Tier 1 program, an organization does not submit a Tier 1 Renewal Application for the program, that program will be removed from the Portfolio of Upstream Programs. Organizations with a program that has been removed from the Portfolio for failure to reapply within the required three-year application renewal period may submit a new Portfolio application at any time, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the new Portfolio submission.

**Renewal Process for Programs Currently Approved as Tier 2**

1. An organization with a program that is approved on the Portfolio of Upstream Programs as Tier 2 has three years from the date of approval to submit a new Tier 2 Application for this program, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the new Tier 2 submission.
2. All organizations with approved Tier 2 programs will receive emailed notices regarding the date their programs will expire as approved Tier 2 Portfolio Programs, the policies

regarding renewal, and specific types of technical assistance available to help them submit a new Tier 2 Portfolio Application. These email notices will be sent 24, 12, 6, and 3 months prior to a program's expiration date.

3. Organizations submitting a Tier 2 program for renewal should check the *Renewal* box at the top of the Tier 2 Application Form. All other information in the Tier 2 renewal application may either be copied from the original Tier 2 approved application or updated to reflect changes in the program content, literature review, logic model, program manual, and evaluation methods. All Tier 2 program renewal applications will be evaluated by the Portfolio Review Committee according to the approved procedures that are in place at the time of the Tier 2 renewal application.
4. If within three years of having an approved Tier 2 program, an organization does not submit a Tier 2 Renewal Application for the program, that program will be removed from the Portfolio of Upstream Programs. Organizations with a program that has been removed from the Portfolio for failure to reapply within the required three-year application renewal period may submit a new Portfolio application at any time, using the approved forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the new Portfolio submission.

### **Renewal Process for Programs Currently Approved as Tier 3**

1. An organization with a program that is approved on the Portfolio of Upstream Programs as Tier 3 has three years from the date of approval to submit a Tier 2 Application for this program, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the Tier 2 submission. In the three years after having a program approved as a Tier 3 program, the organization is expected to implement the Evaluation Plan that was included in its original Tier 3 application and develop a robust Program Manual. All Tier 2 program submissions for programs that have previously been approved as Tier 3 will be evaluated by the Portfolio Review Committee according to the approved procedures that are in place at the time of the Tier 2 application.
2. All organizations with approved Tier 3 programs will receive emailed notices regarding the date their programs will expire as approved Tier 3 Portfolio Programs, the policies regarding renewal, and specific types of technical assistance available to help them implement the Evaluation Plan that was approved as part of their Tier 3 Portfolio Application. These email notices will be sent 24, 12, 6, and 3 months prior to a program's expiration date.
3. If extenuating circumstances, such as significant changes in leadership, governance, programming, physical environment, and funding, have made it impossible for the organization to have executed their approved Evaluation Plan or created a robust Program Manual within three years, the organization may submit the program again as a new Tier 3 Program application, using the Tier 3 instructions and application forms from the Upstream Investments website at the time of its Tier 3 re-application. Organizations submitting a Tier 3 program for renewal as a Tier 3 program should check the *Renewal* box at the top of the Tier 3 Application Form. In addition, the organization must submit a cover letter with its Tier 3 Application describing the detailed reasons why it is not submitting this program as a Tier 2 program. All Tier 3 program renewal applications for

4. programs that have previously been approved as Tier 3 will be evaluated by the Portfolio Review Committee according to the approved procedures that are in place at the time of the Tier 3 renewal application.
5. If an organization has a program that has been approved to be on the portfolio as a Tier 3 program for two consecutive three-year periods, it must submit a Tier 2 Application for the program within three years of the date of the second approval, using the instructions and application forms from the Upstream Investments website at the time of the Tier 2 submission. If an organization does not submit a Tier 2 Application for a program that has been on the Portfolio as a Tier 3 program for six consecutive years, that program will be removed from the Portfolio of Upstream Programs.
6. If within three years of having an approved Tier 3 program, an organization does not submit either a Tier 2 Application for that program or a Tier 3 Application with a cover letter explaining why it is submitting that program as a Tier 3 program again, that program will be removed from the Portfolio of Upstream Programs. Organizations with a program that has been removed from the Portfolio for failure to reapply within the required three-year application renewal period may submit a new Portfolio application at any time, using the approved forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the new Portfolio submission.

<b>Upstream Portfolio Submissions Approval and Expiration Dates</b>				
<b>Program</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Tier</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>	<b>Expiration Date</b>
Project SUCCESS	The Sonoma County SAP Collaborative	1	11/17/2010	11/16/2013
Schools of Hope Literacy Initiative	United Way of the Wine Country	3	11/17/2010	11/16/2013
AVANCE	First 5 Sonoma County	1	11/29/2010	11/28/2013
Nurse-Family Partnership	Department of Health Services	1	12/2/2010	12/1/2013
Structured Decision Making	Sonoma County Human Services Department	1	5/3/2011	5/2/2014
Project RESPECT	Drug Abuse Alternatives Center	1	5/6/2011	5/5/2014
Reach out and Read	First 5 Sonoma County	2	5/6/2011	5/5/2014
Healthy for Life	St Joseph Health System	2	5/19/2011	5/18/2014
LifeLong Connections Program	Sonoma County Human Services Department	3	5/19/2011	5/18/2014
Sierra Youth Center	Probation	2	5/19/2011	5/18/2014
Dependency Drug Court with Strengthening Families Component	Sonoma County Human Services and Health Services Depts.	2	7/1/2011	6/30/1014
Family Justice Center	Sonoma County DA's Office	2	7/1/2011	6/30/1014
Gang Prevention Through Targeted Outreach	Boys & Girls Clubs of Central Sonoma County	2	7/1/2011	6/30/1014
Girls Circle	Probation (Sierra Camp, Juvenile Hall, Probation)	2	7/1/2011	6/30/1014
Project Learn	Boys & Girls Clubs of Central Sonoma County	1	7/1/2011	6/30/1014
Project SUCCESS	Drug Abuse Alternatives Center	1	7/1/2011	6/30/1014
SMART Moves	Boys & Girls Clubs of Marin and Southern Sonoma Counties	1	7/1/2011	6/30/1014
TRIBES	Boys & Girls Clubs of Central Sonoma County	2	7/1/2011	6/30/1014
Restorative Justice Conferencing	Restorative Resources	1	8/11/2011	8/10/2014
Girls Circle	Petaluma People Services Center	2	8/12/2011	8/11/2014
Healthier Living	Northern California Center for Well Being	1	8/12/2011	8/11/2014
A Matter of Balance	Sonoma County Human Services Department / Adult & Aging, Area Agency on Aging	1	8/12/2011	8/11/2014
Prades Unidos	Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County	2	8/12/2011	8/11/2014
Pasitos Playgroups	Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County	2	8/12/2011	8/11/2014
Triple Play	Boys & Girls Clubs of Marin and Southern Sonoma Counties	2	8/12/2011	8/11/2014
Families in Action	Petaluma People Services Center	1	9/16/2011	9/15/2014
Motivational Interviewing	Drug Abuse Alternatives Center	1	9/23/2011	9/22/2014
Project Learn	Boys & Girls Clubs of Sonoma Valley	1	9/30/2011	9/29/2014
SMART Moves	Boys & Girls Clubs of Sonoma Valley	1	9/30/2011	9/29/2014
Triple Play	Boys & Girls Clubs of Sonoma Valley	2	9/30/2011	9/29/2014
Living with Diabetes	Northern California Center for Well Being	1	10/19/2011	10/18/2014
Safe School Ambassadors	Community Matters	2	1/4/2012	1/3/2015
Youth Employment & Education (YouthBuild Santa Rosa)	Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County	3	1/23/2012	1/22/2015
Aggression Replacement Training	The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship	1	2/10/2012	2/9/2015
Aggression Replacement Training	California Youth Outreach	1	2/10/2012	2/9/2015
Family Child Care Home Educational Network	River to Coast & Children & Family Circle	3	2/10/2012	2/9/2015

<b>Upstream Portfolio Submissions Approval and Expiration Dates</b>				
<b>Program</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Tier</b>	<b>Date Approved</b>	<b>Expiration Date</b>
Families in Action	Sonoma County Adult and Youth Development	1	2/10/2012	2/9/2015
Tackling Tough Skills	Social Advocates for Youth	2	2/10/2012	2/9/2015
Girls Circle	The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship	2	3/22/2012	3/21/2015
Motivational Interviewing	The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship	1	4/30/2012	4/29/2015
THP Plus	TLC Child and Family Services	2	5/18/2012	5/17/2015
Motivational Interviewing	Petaluma People Services Center	1	6/4/2012	6/3/2015
Coping Cat	Petaluma People Services Center	1	6/12/2012	6/11/2015
PACEAPP	Professional Association for Childhood Education Alternative Payment Program	2	6/12/2012	6/11/2015
Center for Economic Success Outreach Plan	Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County	3	6/25/2012	6/24/2015
Seeking Safety	Community Support Network	1	6/25/2012	6/24/2015
AVID	Sonoma County Office of Education	2	6/29/2012	6/29/2015
Cognitive Behavioral Therapy	Petaluma People Services Center	1	6/29/2012	6/29/2015
Somatic Experiencing Brief Stabilization Program	Sonoma County Family Youth & Children's Services	3	8/6/2012	8/5/2015
WHEEL Plus: Family-Friendly Workplace Policies	Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce	3	8/6/2012	8/5/2015
Partners for Change Outcomes Management System	Petaluma People Services Center	2	8/17/2012	8/16/2015
Value in Preschool	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County (4Cs)	3	9/6/2012	9/5/2015
CARES Plus	Sonoma County Office of Education, Child Care Planning Council	2	9/11/2012	9/10/2015
Sonoma County Youth Ecology Corps	Sonoma County Human Services Department	3	9/17/2012	9/16/2015
Seeking Safety	Women's Recovery Services	1	10/1/2012	9/30/2015
Guiding Good Choices	The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship	1	10/8/2012	10/7/2015
Scholarship Sonoma County/10,000 Degrees	Community Foundation Sonoma County	2	10/17/2012	10/16/2015
Summer Search	Summer Search	2	10/22/2012	10/21/2015
Southwest Family Resource Centers	Community Action Partnership of Sonoma County	3	1/9/2013	1/8/2016
Gateway to Quality	Child Care Planning Council of Sonoma County / SCOE	3	2/15/2013	2/14/2016
iDo26.2	Volunteer Center / Department of Health Services	3	3/6/2013	3/5/2016
Tutoring and Mentoring (TAM)	The Salvation Army	3	4/9/2013	4/8/2016
Family Therapy	Social Advocates for Youth	2	4/24/2013	4/23/2013
MyLIFE Transition Program	VOICES	3	4/29/2013	4/28/2016
Double Punches Boxing Club	Salvation Army	2	5/3/2013	5/2/2016
Trauma Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy	The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship	1	5/3/2013	5/2/2016
Roseland University Prep Knights Academy After School Program	Roseland Charter School	2	5/13/2013	5/12/2016
Cooperative Parenting and Divorce	Petaluma People Services Center	2	5/16/2013	5/15/2016
Latino Service Providers Sonoma County	West County Community Services	2	5/16/2013	5/15/2016