



Executive Committee Meeting Agenda

July 18, 2016, 1:30 p.m. to 2:30 p.m.

Family Justice Center, 2755 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa

All supporting documents are available at www.UpstreamInvestments.org and at the Board of Supervisors office at 575 Administration Drive, Room 100A, Santa Rosa, CA, during normal business hours. For accessibility assistance with this agenda or supporting documents, please e-mail Upstream@schsd.org or call 707.565.8797.

- | | | |
|-------------|--|---------------------|
| 1:30 | Welcome, introductions, agenda, minutes ACTION ITEM | <i>Jerry Dunn</i> |
| 1:35 | Staff update | <i>Joni Thacher</i> |
| 1:40 | 2014 – 16 Progress Report and Next Steps – ACTION ITEM
<i>Approve Progress Report for submission to the Board of Supervisors</i> | <i>Oscar Chavez</i> |
| 2:10 | August Policy Committee Agenda Planning
<i>Finalize Policy Committee Agenda</i> | <i>Oscar Chavez</i> |
| 2:25 | Public comment | |
| 2:30 | Adjourn | |

Upstream Investments Executive Committee 2016 Meeting Schedule

All meetings are from 9:00 – 10:00 am at the Family Justice Center

September 7,

October 5, December 7



Wednesday, June 1, 2016 Executive Committee Meeting Minutes

9:00 a.m. – 10:00 a.m.

Family Justice Center

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services Department (Project staff)
 Barbie Robinson, Department of Health Services
 Beth Brown, Community Foundation
 Jerry Dunn, Human Services Department
 Jill Ravitch, District Attorney
 Joni Thacher, Human Services Department (Project staff)
 Helen Simi, Human Services Department (Project staff)
 Oscar Chavez, Human Services (Project leader)

Steven Herrington, Sonoma County Office of Education
 Susan Gorin, Board of Supervisors
 Tim Reese, Community Action Partnership

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
<p>Welcome, Introductions, Minutes</p>	<p>Jerry welcomed everyone and reviewed the agenda.</p> <p>Motion to approve the minutes was made by Jill and seconded by Steve.</p> <p>A conversation ensued to address Jill’s question regarding the membership requirements to seat senior-level positions on the Policy Committee. Jill feels that her chief deputy participating on the Policy Committee felt it wasn’t a great use of his time, so she reassigned the seat to her analyst. She was told that because her analyst was not a senior-level position, she did not meet requirements to sit on the Policy Committee. Jill feels that an analyst is considered senior-level in her department.</p> <p>Jerry: The intent is to have decision-makers at the table. Does your analyst have access to you (Jill)?</p> <p>Jill: My analyst reports directly to the ASO but has the opportunity to report directly to me.</p> <p>Supervisor Gorin: The bigger question is, what can we do to be more engaging at the Policy Committee instead of just having warm bodies present?</p>	<p>Move to approve the minutes: Yes: 6 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	<p>None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Oscar: In our evaluation process we are looking into the same question of whether we need to seat by choice or by design. We will review this more deeply to elevate the level of engagement.</p> <p>Jill: Each organization is also structured differently and the directors of each department should be able to select the seat members. The analyst I have selected oversees the grants for this department. She came to the last meeting and seemed to have gotten a lot out of it.</p> <p>Jerry would like to “try it” and allow for the analyst from the DA’s office to sit on the Policy Committee.</p>		
Staff update	<p>Joni provided an update on the Portfolio and technical assistance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are currently 95 programs on the Portfolio. Since April 6, we’ve had 3 applications approved to the Portfolio: • Child & Adult Care Food Program – Tier 2 – 4Cs: Goal is to improve the health of young children through improved nutrition served by child care providers and preschools. Reimbursement to child care centers for serving nutritious meals and snacks to the children. • Grade Level Proficiency Project – Tier 3 – Sonoma Valley Education Foundation: Professional development coaching program for teachers in grades 1-3 with students who have below grade level proficiency in reading and math. • Imagine You – Tier 3 – Integrative Medical Clinic Foundation: Supporting individuals will increase self-efficacy, make healthier choices, recognize their progress toward their own, self-created Image of Health and eventually improve their health. 	None	None
Review Progress Report Timeline	<p>Upstream’s compressed timeline of the report to the BOS on August 23, 2016:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • June 20– Policy Committee Progress Report Workgroup <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Review draft of report ○ Provide conceptual edits ○ Recommend approval of report by Executive Committee • July 1– Staff <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Complete revisions recommended by the Workgroup ○ Develop Power Point and script ○ Complete ancillary documents • July 6 – Executive Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approve Upstream Report with any recommended changes (due to CAO 7/20) 	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • August 10 – Policy Committee <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approve August 23 presentation 		
LFA Evaluation: PHASE 2	<p>Oscar presented on Phase 2 of LFA’s Evaluation of Upstream Investment Preliminary Findings</p> <p><i>Phase 2 Data Collection & Analysis consists of inquiries on:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change in organizational behavior and systems • Progress toward Upstream’s intended goals <p>Main focus of research questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in High-Quality Programming (Have organizations changed the way they address program design within their organization?) • Local Investments • Provider Organizational Change • Funder Organizational Change • Change in Population Level Indicators • Influence of Upstream <p>Joni summarized the data of provider and funder survey response rates. There were 62 responses from the provider survey. 53% of providers on the Portfolio responded to the survey vs 33% of providers not on the Portfolio. 13 out of 18 government and private funders responded to the survey.</p> <p>Is there an increase in the number of high-quality, evidence-informed programs implemented in Sonoma County? There have actually been 49 NEW applications approved, but these are not unique programs. In 2014, there were 65 quality programs on the Portfolio, today there are 95; this is a 46% increase in high-quality programming.</p> <p>How and to what extent is there an increased awareness and understanding of the cost-benefits of prevention-focused and evidence-informed programs and practices? LFA assessed the degree to which organizations consider the importance of a program’s cost benefit and return on investment for evidence informed practice and what they attribute that increase in knowledge to.</p>	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Organizations’ responses to inquiries on awareness of Return on Investment (ROI):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our organization’s awareness of ROI has increased over the past several years. <i>64% Portfolio agencies/70% non-Portfolio agencies agreed/strongly agreed with this statement.</i> • We look for opportunities to partner with others to contribute to ROI. <i>69% Portfolio agencies/85% non-Portfolio agencies agreed/strongly agreed with this statement.</i> • ROI is very important, but our organization has scarce time and resources, so we focus our efforts on our first priority: our own mission. <i>53% Portfolio agencies/30% non-Portfolio agencies agreed/strongly agreed with this statement.</i> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>Jerry: In re to previous discussions as to whether we place too much emphasis on getting on the Portfolio, it is interesting to see the higher response rates from the non-Portfolio agencies. What constitutes a non-Portfolio program?</p> <p>Joni: These orgs self-reported they are implementing evidence-based programs but have not applied to the Portfolio.</p> <p>Supervisor Gorin: In addition to defining the size of an agency, it is important to dive down on which agencies responded in which ways.</p> <p>Oscar: We want to focus on overall improvement of quality of our programming and shifting around how organizations handle program design and implementation.</p> <p>Supervisor Gorin: The Board is very excited to receive this report as I think it will be the meat of the conversation and answer some pressing questions. It will lay down what we had hoped to gain through this process. We are trying to convince agencies that by implementing through evidence-based practices, we will have reached some significant and intended outcomes.</p> <p>For Portfolio providers reporting increased awareness of ROI, 31% attributed “a lot” of awareness from First 5, 26% to Upstream and 26% to Health Action.</p> <p>How have providers shifted professional practice, knowledge and behavior, culture, operating procedures and policy in alignment with the goals and strategies of Upstream Investments Policy?</p>		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The changes in prioritizing prevention in their organization from 3-5 years ago, the shift goes from 54% to 88%. The large shift is also true in non-Portfolio organizations. • There is also a significant community-wide shift increasing the practice of evidence-based programming and focus on prevention. • 80%+ attribute the increase and shift to funding opportunities. <p>Can we discern a story about how Upstream Investments has contributed to the changes we see?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LFA asked the question about what can we attribute these changes to? • Agencies that implement an evidence-based program were asked to state their main drivers: due to an internally driven desire; this is a way to increase program efficacy; pressure from funders; accessible and valuable TA support and community presentations. • Some outcomes from receiving TA and going through Portfolio process: 63% began fidelity monitoring; 61% invested in staff development to ensure knowledge of efficient programming; • Providers report that applying to the Portfolio has allowed them to access additional funding (87%); helped improve their programming (85%); better collect data and use data for evaluation (76%). • 63% feel that the process itself, although has benefits, is too bureaucratic and tedious. <p>Barbie: We need to look at how we interpret the “somewhat true” response in order to more clearly define the results.</p> <p>How have funders shifted funding priorities and processes in alignment with Upstream Investments Policy? In 2014/15...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 70% of funders did not require grantees to be included on the Portfolio. • 80% of funders did not require demonstration of pending Portfolio approval. • 8/11 funders expect or require grantees to propose evidence-informed programs. • 5/6 require a logic model. • Only 4/7 give bonus points to programs on the Portfolio. • Compared to 2013/14, there was slight, overall growth in the responses between these time periods. <p>How are local investments <u>in Portfolio programs</u> related to geographic location of specific</p>		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>communities in Sonoma County, in particular, County supervisorial districts? LFA worked with Upstream Investments staff to gather information from major <i>local</i> funders on their investments in Upstream Portfolio organizations and programs during FY 2013-2014 and 2014-2015. Funders were also asked to share information on grantee requirements that are aligned with Upstream principles.</p> <p>Numbers drawn from funder provided data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A total of \$26,058,490 has been invested into Portfolio programs from the City, County and local private funders. • The 5 Districts have invested a total of \$125,00 in 2 Economic Wellness programs (Earn it, Keep it, Save it is an additional program added to the Portfolio that was not tracked here. Included, it would add an additional ¼ million to the total); \$16,094,347 in 30 Education programs; and \$9,839,143 in 25 Health programs. <p>Oscar: We need to find a mechanism to measure how the dollars are being invested geographically. We can't answer that question until we set a mechanism in place.</p> <p>Supervisor Gorin: We should recognize that the other 4 Supervisors represent Santa Rosa and, overall, that is where the majority population is and more importantly, where the needs are. Somehow we need to continue to focus on where the needs are and not distributing the resources evenly just to spread out services.</p>		
Public Comment	None	None	None
Minutes/Adjourn	Meeting adjourned 10:10 a.m.	None	None