



Appeal Committee Meeting Minutes

Wednesday December 12, 2012, 1:00-2:30 p.m.

2300 County Center Drive, Santa Rosa CA

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

Dave Koch, Probation Department

Kathleen Kane, Community Development Commission

Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department (Project Staff)

Marla Stuart, Human Services Department (Project Manager)

Melanie Dodson, Child Care Council of Sonoma County, 4Cs (Applicant)

Peter Rumble, Department of Health Services

Susan Katz, Child Care Council of Sonoma County, 4Cs (Applicant)

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes	<p>Introductions</p> <p>Approval of Minutes from Seeking Safety Appeal June 6, 2012</p>	Consensus approval of minutes	None
Review of Appeals Process	<p>The Human Services Department is to deliver the first statement on behalf of the Portfolio Review Committee.</p> <p>The appealing agency then makes a statement. They are allowed two speakers.</p> <p>Next the Appeal Committee may ask questions and deliberate.</p> <p>The appealing agency may then make a closing statement.</p> <p>The appeal committee will make a decision.</p>	None	None
Statement on behalf of the Portfolio Review Committee	<p>Marla Stuart on behalf of the Review Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Upstream staff and Review committee appreciates 4Cs participation with Upstream and their dedication to using evidence in their work. They recently had another program approved by the Review Committee and clearly understand the principles of Evidence-informed practice. • Through Portfolio work, we are exploring the concept of fidelity. It is complex and this will be a difficult decision but this is ground breaking work for our community. <p>Portfolio Review Committee Recommendations (see attached report for detail)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Uphold the Portfolio Review Committee recommendation to deny Tier 1 placement due to unacceptable adaptation. 2. Invite 4Cs of Sonoma County to re-submit California State Preschool Program for Tier 2. 	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Statement from the Appealing Agency	<p>Melanie Dodson on behalf of 4Cs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4Cs appreciate participating in Upstream and regardless of the outcome today, they will continue their participation • Partnerships with parents are core to their organization. They would like to improve documentation of the great relationships they have with parents. • Sue will speak specifically about the program as she knows them best. <p>Susan Katz on behalf of 4Cs (see attached report for details)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parents using childcare have limited time. • Sue reviewed the various ways that 4Cs connects with parents including the parent handbook, family questionnaire, teacher conferences, daily behavior reports and check-ins, child assessments, monthly celebrations and monthly pancake breakfasts. • Parents or children in need of additional support are invited to meet with program staff and may receive referrals to parenting programs such as Triple P or other support services. <p>4Cs work has strong partnerships with parents. While they are working towards better quantitative measures of this partnership, they do have many examples where this partnership can be seen.</p>	None	None
Questions and deliberation	<p>Questions from the Appeal Committee and Answers from 4Cs and Upstream Staff</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why aren't you doing more frequent visits? Would you do more if you had more funding? <i>Yes it is funding. State funding has been cut.</i> • It sounds like you do have a lot of contact with parents. Why doesn't that count for the dosage? How can you be sure that the contact is meaningful? <i>You can see the great turn out at the center social events and you can see in the culture of the centers. Parents contact the organization for help with other things in their life. They have long-term relationships with parents. They follow up after leaving the center. While we do not have longitudinal studies, there is anecdotal evidence to show they have strong relationships with the parents.</i> • Is what you are doing interchangeable with what the model calls for? Home visits? <i>No I can't say it is the same but we are clearly communicating the message of partnership with parents and about 25% of parents participate in behavioral consultation or parenting programs which include home visits.</i> • It certainly seems like you have strong relationships with parents. I know that this is difficult to quantify but it would be nice to know for example that every parent is having a check in. <i>We don't quantify but staff are required by State and other regulations to do daily health checks and other interactions with parents.</i> 	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Questions and deliberation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is interesting about the model that it acknowledges that it may not be safe for staff to visit the children’s homes. • Is it possible that other people than the parents are picking them up from school and participating in the daily check-ins? <i>Typically it is the parent or guardian that picks up and drops off the child from school.</i> • What percentage of parents do you think are participating in these other means of communication with the school? <i>Conferences and surveys have a high percentage of completion (95-99%). We also have sign in sheets for all social and education events and could get that data.</i> • Are all these parent interactions occurring in the same way at each center? <i>Yes but we do have one center that is doing more.</i> • We need to look at both the quantity and the quality of these parent interactions. • It seems that the quantity has been set by the research and we don’t want to question the research on that front. <i>The Review Committee has taken this seriously. The researchers have determined that Head Start does not meet this standard and one of the reasons listed is lack of home visits.</i> • If you can put a price tag on the home-visit piece and you are put on Tier 2, maybe that will be a way to work on getting funding? <i>Yes. Also a reason we chose not to apply for Tier 2 was that we thought that we would need to do an evaluation. We cannot afford to evaluate this program at this time.</i> <i>For Tier 2 it is not necessary that programs have an evaluation of their exact program, it is acceptable to use an evaluation of a similar program.</i> 	None	None
Closing statement	Thank you so much for this opportunity. I speak on behalf of my staff. I know they do have these relationships with these parents. I am not a data person and while I understand the need for data collection, I stand by my argument.	None	None
Decision	<p>Motion to sustain the Portfolio Review Committee decision.</p> <p>David: We are working with our clients to understand how to quantify these relationships. It is challenging. Your program certainly shows great results.</p> <p>Peter: This is difficult for me because while I am a data person, I believe in the value of your program. I would encourage the development of a mechanism of quantifying what is currently being done.</p> <p>Kathleen: I support Peter’s comment and also suggest the exploration of the possibility of working together with health care or other community workers to deliver home visits. Quantification would then not be an issue. Definition of whether visits by others meets fidelity criteria might be.</p>	<p>Motion: David</p> <p>Second: Peter</p> <p>Ayes: 3</p> <p>Noes: 0</p>	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Appeal Process Discussion	<p>We have now had two appeals and staff would like to hear from the Committee members about the process and any suggestions they might have.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to know more detail about the reviewers' decisions and reasoning, especially when there may have been an initial difference of opinion. • It is very helpful to have some information in advance. As long as the applicant has an opportunity to submit a report to the committee, the Committee would like a report from staff, with or without an accompanying report from the applicant. • Public deliberation is working fine. If the Committee can't make a decision, they will hold a second meeting. 	None	In the future, staff can provide the score sheets and Portfolio minutes related to the application in question.
Public Comment	None	None	None
Adjourn	None	None	None