



Wednesday, June 6, 2011 - Appeal Committee Meeting Minutes

2:00 – 3:00 p.m.

Copperhill Way – Jane Addams Conf Room

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

David Koch, Sonoma County Probation

Kathleen Kane, Community Development Commission

Peter Rumble, Department of Health Services (Committee Chair)

Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department (Project staff)

Marla Stuart, Human Services Department (Project Manager)

Tom Bieri, Community Support Network (Applicant)

Members of the Public (listed alphabetically)

None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Agenda	Peter Rumble began meeting at 2:07pm	None	None
Review of Appeals Process	Reviewed attached document: Application Review, Decision and Appeal Process. This document states that an organization may “appeal the accuracy of the decision (of the Portfolio Review Committee) but may not appeal the tier criteria.	None	None
Statement on behalf of the Portfolio Review Committee	Presented by Marla Stuart of the Human Services Department <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Reviewed attached document: Report to the Portfolio Appeal Committee regarding Seeking Safety submitted by the Community Support Network. – Referred to Acceptable Clearinghouses documents and explained the process for listing clearinghouses on this document. Also explained how the Portfolio Review Committee decided to use the SAMHSA/NREPP clearinghouse scores given that they do not attach any labels to these scores. Previously an average score was acceptable. That was changed to include some minimum scores in each category. – Referred to http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/ and the scores that Seeking Safety has been given. They do not meet the guidelines for the Portfolio based on scores in the areas of potential for confounding variables and appropriateness of data analysis. – They are also on CA Evidence Based Clearinghouse with a provisional rating. Lastly, Seeking Safely is on the HealthSonoma.org but the rating is based on their SAMHSA scores. – Seeking Safety is eligible to apply for Tier 2. 	None	None

<p>Opening Statement</p>	<p>Presented by Tom Bieri of Community Support Network</p> <p>Tom acknowledged Lisa Najavits, the developer of Seeking Safety and took a moment to talk about the benefits of the program in helping adolescents and adults with trauma issues achieve the first step in their path to recovery.</p> <p>Reviewed attached prepared statement (reference documents mentioned are available upon request.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In a SAMHSA webinar, Recovery to Practice, Seeking Safety appears on a short list of “Evidence-Based Practices.” This list was compiled by Doctor Paula Panzer. It is his understanding that in the early phases of the Portfolio, this would have been sufficient for Tier 1 placement. Guidelines for placing programs on the Portfolio should be equal over time (later programs should not be held to a higher standard). - SAMHSA’s own guidelines are the best guidelines to use when interpreting their research. On http://www.nrepp.samhsa.gov/ study strengths and weaknesses are described: Strengths-findings were consistently positive in a variety of domains. Some studies showed very careful attention to fidelity. Weaknesses-Some studies used convenience samples. Sample size was often small making it difficult to rule out confounding variables or make statistical inferences. Controlling for confounding variables is a formidable challenge in human studies and small samples sizes is consistent with the guidelines for effective recovery groups (eight participants is considered ideal). SAMHSA/NREPP also says “NREPP’s ratings does not reflect an intervention’s effectiveness...users should carefully read the key findings sections in the interventions summary to understand the research results for each outcome.” From the findings of the studies published on NREPP, “In a study of incarcerated women, 9 out of 17 participants in Seeking Safety no longer met the diagnostic criteria for PTSD at the end of treatment. Community Support Network is also achieving results. 22 of 24 clients participating in Seeking Safety have reporting having utilized positive coping strategies they learned in the group and these tolls are helping them cope with stress without using drugs or alcohol. - Seeking Safety was an “evidence-based practice” even before it was submitted to SAMHSA/NREPP. Many of the elements of the program were used in other evidence-based program before being incorporated into Seeking Safety. Provided several examples of this. Also provided examples of other agencies that are using or referring to Seeking Safety as a best practice. 	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Deliberation</p>	<p>Peter opened deliberation</p> <p>Kathleen asked if waiting for the CA Evidence Based Practice Clearinghouse had been discussed. She asked if they are put on Tier 2 and then later approved by the CAEBC, would they automatically be moved to Tier 1. Asked Tom why he did not decide to apply for Tier 2.</p> <p>Tom: This program is as good as it gets. Would be embarrassed have the program had been downgraded locally. Also we should be using NREPP the way they suggest.</p> <p>David: You are suggesting a change to the criteria?</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>

<p>Deliberation</p>	<p>Tom: Yes</p> <p>David: Why was Tier 2 recommended to them?</p> <p>Marla: They don't meet our criteria for Tier 1. Read email about a discussion with NREPP on how to use their scores. They do not recommend how to use the scores. Yes there is research that shows Seeking Safety is effective. However the weaknesses that have been pointed out are real. They have told us the pros and cons of the research: Small sample size and confounding variables.</p> <p>Kathleen: Question about sample size</p> <p>Marla: Treatment groups and sample sizes are not the same. You can have a small treatment group and a large sample that includes more than one treatment group.</p> <p>Tom: Part of why we don't have large sample sizes is the developer is unwilling to not treat the control group. Also there are more studies not listed on the clearinghouse website but it is unlikely they will put those additional studies up soon.</p> <p>Peter: Clarified that the tiers are a label for the existing research but not a judgment on the worth of the program.</p> <p>Tom: Understands that we are encouraging funders to use the portfolio regardless of the tier, however there is an implicit judgment of the worth of the program based on the tier system. Also talked about the fairness of the legacy programs that were held to lower standards yet are on Tier 1.</p> <p>Kathleen: Important to be clear about how the portfolio in funding decisions</p> <p>Marla: Yes, we are clear about how to use the Portfolio in funding decisions but we can be more aggressive. Put a note on the website about how to use the Portfolio correctly. Explained that we do not except legacy programs from NREPP.</p> <p>Kathleen: Does the program have to focus on children?</p> <p>Marla: Prevention focused with any population is ok.</p> <p>Kathleen: Concern about the Healthy Sonoma rating decision.</p> <p>Marla: Explained how we assess clearinghouses and said she would be taking Healthy Sonoma to the review committee to see if they want to continue to use this given the contradiction.</p> <p>Tom: Asked about first few programs that were submitted to the portfolio.</p> <p>Marla: There were six pilot programs. They were not subjected to a significantly different standard that we have now.</p> <p>David: Question about the webinar.</p> <p>Tom: Answer</p> <p>Kathleen: Voiced concern about the webinar and the fact that SAMSHA is using the NREPP to say that Seeking Safety is evidence based.</p>		
----------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

Public comment	None	None	None
Closing statement	Presented by Tom Bieri Thanked the Appeal Committee and Marla. Stated that he has always looked up to SAMHSA as an authority in this field and is concerned that we are there is a disparity between how they use their scores and how the Review Committee is using.	None	None
Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Peter thanked Tom for the work they are doing at his agency. Stated that we are not making a judgment about the quality of the program but the quality of the research. The work is making a positive impact. Peter stated he is glad that the tier criteria were discussed but that it is the role of the Review Committee to make any necessary changes to the criteria. There are two viable recommendations on the table: Peter feels the one is to wait to hear about the CAEBC decision but that Tier 2 is a good place to be on the portfolio and applying for Tier 2 is another good option. He understands that funder interpretation is an issue but states that the Portfolio is not the only way to say you are evidence based. He added that the County does not use the separate tiers for funding decisions. - Kathleen agreed that it is not the role of the Appeal Committee to question the criteria. She does not have a problem relying on existing criteria and thinks funders will not see a big difference between Tier 1 and Tier 2. She hopes that the provisional rating is changed. - David: Agreed with Peter as well. - Motion to uphold the decision of the Portfolio Review Committee. 	Motion: Kathleen Kane Second: David Ayes: 3 Noes: 0	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:15 p.m.	None	None



Report to the Portfolio Appeal Committee
Regarding Seeking Safety submitted by Community Support Network

June 6, 2012 2:00 p.m.
Copperhill Parkway-Jane Adams Room, Santa Rosa California

Representing the Portfolio Review Committee
Marla Stuart, Human Services Department

Seeking Safety Description

Seeking Safety is a present-focused treatment for clients with a history of trauma and substance abuse. The treatment was designed for flexible use in groups or individual formats, male and female clients, and a variety of settings (e.g., outpatient, inpatient, residential). Seeking Safety focuses on coping skills and psycho-education.

Application Timeline

August 18, 2011 Seeking Safety Portfolio application received
August 19, 2011 First review received recommending Tier 1
August 30, 2011 Second review received recommending no Tier
September 28, 2011 Portfolio Review Committee decision for no tier placement
November 8, 2011..... Board of Supervisors Commissions a new Upstream Policy Committee and a formal Portfolio Review Committee
January 12, 2012 Community Support Network is formally notified of no tier placement, invited to apply for Tier 2, and is offered the right to appeal
February 7, 2012..... Review Committee meets to define appeal procedures
??..... Portfolio Appeal Committee trained
May 3, 2012..... Upstream Policy Committee approves appeal procedures

Attachments

1. Portfolio Review Committee Application Review, Decision, and Appeal Process
2. Acceptable Clearinghouses

Discussion

1. Tier Requested

Community Support Network has submitted Seeking Safety for Tier 1 of the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs. The Portfolio Review Committee has determined that Seeking Safety does not meet the criteria for Tier 1. Community Support Network has requested an appeal hearing.

2. Appeal Right

Organizations who are not satisfied with the decision of the Portfolio Review Committee have the “right to appeal the decision. The organization may appeal the accuracy of the decision but may not appeal the tier criteria. (In other words, they may appeal on the basis that they do in fact meet the criteria, but they may not appeal based on the idea that the criteria should be changed.)” The Upstream Policy Committee has approved the Appeal Process.

3. Definition of Evidence-Based Practices (as required for Tier 1)

A variety of evidence-based clearinghouses evaluate whether or not programs meet the criteria for being evidence-based. These clearinghouses use essentially the same criteria: rigorous evaluation using experimental or quasi-experimental design, publication in a peer-reviewed journal, replication, and replicability. Often, these rigorous reviews to be considered evidence-based 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 review; Sonoma County does not have these resources. Therefore, the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs uses the inclusion on a national clearinghouses as the criteria for evidence-based practice. The Portfolio Review Committee does not independently determine whether or not a program is evidence-based practice.

4. Acceptable National Clearinghouses

Most national clearinghouses give programs they have reviewed a rating. These ratings may or may not correlate to the Portfolio requirements for Tier 1. See the “Upstream Clearinghouse Crosswalk” for a list of clearinghouses and the rating on each that meets the Portfolio criteria for Tier 1. Organizations are invited to “request that a clearinghouse be reviewed for inclusion” on the list of Acceptable Clearinghouses.

5. Portfolio use of NREPP Rating

The SAMHSA’s National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP) publishes a score for all programs they evaluate. They are neutral and do not make a

statement about whether or not a program is evidence-based. NREPP users can determine how to use the NREPP scores. The Portfolio Review Committee initially used an average NREPP score to meet the criteria for Tier 1. Based on a request from the Community Support Network, the Portfolio Review Committee revisited this decision and found that the California HealthyKids Resource Center (California Department of Education) uses a minimum rating rather than an average rating. The Portfolio Review Committee decided to replicate this practice. See the attached Acceptable Clearinghouses and Ratings, pages 5-7 for a description of the NREPP ratings as used by the Portfolio.

6. Review of Seeking Safety for the Portfolio

The Portfolio Review Committee has determined that Seeking Safety meets all the criteria for Tier 1 except for inclusion on a national clearinghouse.

Required for Portfolio Inclusion on Tier 1	Seeking Safety
Prevention Focused	Yes
Factors Addressed	Yes
Local Relevancy	Yes
Indicators Addressed	Yes
Listed on Clearinghouse	No
Implemented in Sonoma with Fidelity	Yes

7. NREPP Rating of Seeking Safety

Community Support Network submitted the NREPP listing of Seeking Safety as evidence of being included on a clearinghouse. The following table illustrates the minimum score for each NREPP category and the Seeking Safety score.

NREPP Criteria	Minimum Rating for Portfolio Tier 1	Seeking Safety Ratings
Reliability of Measures	2	2.7, 2.4, 2.3, 2.0
Validity of Measures	2	2.7, 2.4, 2.3, 2.0
Fidelity	2	3.4, 2.9, 2.3, 2.1
Missing Data/Attrition	2	2.2, 2.0, 2.0, 2.0
Confounding Variables	2	1.9, 1.8, 1.7, 1.6
Data Analysis	4	2.0, 2.1, 2.1, 1.9
Implementation Materials	3	4.0
Training and Support	3	4.0
Quality Assurance	3	3.9

9. Seeking Safety on other Clearinghouses

- a. HealthySonoma.org includes Seeking Safety as an Evidence-Based Practice and lists NREPP as the source of the rating.
- b. Child Trends LINKS Database includes Seeking Safety. The Portfolio accepts programs listed on Child Trends “if replication and replicability are included in the description.” Child Trends does not address replication or replicability in their description of Seeking Safety.
- c. The California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse (CEBC) for Child Welfare has also reviewed Seeking Safety. In April, 2012, CEBC awarded a provisional rating of “Supported by Research Evidence” for adults and “Promising Research Evidence” for adolescents. Both of these ratings meet the Portfolio criteria for Tier 1. Comments about the provisional ratings are accepted by CEBC through June 15, 2012 for adolescents and June 19, 2012 for adults.

Portfolio Review Committee Recommendations

1. Invite the Community Support Network to re-submit Seeking Safety for Tier 2.
2. Invite the Community Support Network to re-submit Seeking Safety for Tier 1 when another Clearinghouse determines Seeking Safety to be evidence-based.
3. Invite the Community Support Network to re-submit Seeking Safety when NREPP revises their rating.