



Wednesday, January 21, 2015 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

490 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Manzanita Conference Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting
 Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
 Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
 Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
 Karin Demarest, Community Foundation
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
 Kate Pack, First 5
 Leo Tacata, District Attorney’s Office
 Monique Chapman, Sheriff’s Office
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department
 Stephen Jackson, SCOE

Staff (listed alphabetically)

Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services Department
 Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
 Rebecca Wachsborg, Probation Department
 Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa

Public (listed alphabetically)

Elisabeth Chicoine, Department of Health Service
 Elizabeth Goldman, SAY
 Marian Lindner, SAY
 Melissa Bentley, SAY
 Pauline Richardson, Department of Health Services

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, Updates	<p>Angie welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions.</p> <p>Motion to approve the minutes with an adjustment to page 2. Make the language sound less negative regarding Tier 1 vs Tier 2 criteria.</p> <p>Angie provided an update of recent technical assistance.</p>	<p>Motion to approve the minutes with revisions to page 2: Carol Second: Katie Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	None
Application to the Portfolio: Motivational Interviewing	<p>Motivational Interviewing, SAY, Tier 1</p> <p>Elements for discussion: Adherence, Dose/Exposure</p> <p>Reviewers: Ellen and Stephen</p> <p>Recusals: Rob</p> <p>Stephen – This application discussed a variety of ways to implement the program and SAY</p>	<p>Motion to deny Tier 1 status and recommend technical assistance: Carol Second: Leo</p>	Staff members will provide technical assistance.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>trained their staff well enough based on the descriptions in the clearinghouse.</p> <p>The application didn't use the exact wording on the clearinghouse regarding Dose/Exposure, but I felt SAY's fit in the range and they did more than was required.</p> <p>Ellen – My main issue was the target population. The target population on the clearinghouse is care givers. SAY serves 5 – 25 year olds. I couldn't find evidence that this program was appropriate for children. In fact, OJJDP actually found MI not effective for adolescents. Additionally, I was confused because the application said there was no required dose/exposure even though their practices meet the dose/exposure listed on the clearinghouse.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DAAC is listed on the Portfolio for MI with adolescents recovering from substance abuse. • Could we approve this for 18 – 25 year olds? • As the committee you can motion and vote that the age be changed and the application be resubmitted to the same reviewers. <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>Elizabeth: We use MI in a family setting with parents and youth. Our staff is trained in how to use this with young adults. MI is about style and approach as much as specific modality. We are adherent to the recommended style and techniques.</p> <p>Melissa: I was surprised to hear that it wasn't for adolescents. The training we received was directed to providers that worked with adolescents. A book was written in 2010 to guide the use of MI with adolescents. It has been very effective for getting stuck kids out of the stuck place. When we work with youth we also always work with the parents.</p> <p>Clarification requested from the committee: When you talk about books are they books that tell you how to use MI or do they present studies of how effective it is?</p> <p>Melissa: The books we use are written by the founders to demonstrate effectiveness and include some research.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The question for this committee is is this application suitable for Tier 1 based on the clearinghouse. I don't see where adolescents who are still developing cognitively could be included in this Tier 1 application. This could be a tier 2 application. • Tier 1 does not provide an option for the inclusion of outside literature. It's really an 	<p>Yes: 11 No: 0 Abstain: 1</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>issue of our process.</p> <p>Carol moved to deny this application for Tier 1 and recommend technical assistance.</p> <p>Leo seconded the motion.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If they apply for a Tier 2 they would submit an evaluation report for youth. That would be the appropriate way to bring this before the committee. <p>Motion to deny Tier 1 status passed.</p>		
<p>Application to the Portfolio: Maternal Child Health Field Nursing</p>	<p>Maternal Child Health Field Nursing (MCHFN), Department of Health Services, Tier 3</p> <p>Elements for discussion: Logic Model, Policies and Procedures, Evaluation Plan</p> <p>Reviewers: B.J. and Rob</p> <p>B.J: This is one of the best applications I've seen. The logic model is missing environmental factors, but this is not critical because they are included under the Procedures section. Another potential issue in the logic model is that the reflective supervision piece was not included in the logic model. I thought this was inherent in their process as described in the logic model. There policies and procedures meet our criteria for Tier 3, it's not a manual and it's not supposed to be. I found this to be very thorough. I would expect to see more in a program manual about supervision, but not for policies and procedures.</p> <p>I agree that it is not clear if the evaluation plan can be completed in 3 years, I made the assumption that it could be. To accept an evaluation plan you don't have to have all elements there. I thought this plan would be effective to measure outcomes.</p> <p>Rob: I agree this is a very strong application. The lit review was one of the best home grown lit reviews I've seen. Excellent job using it to shape program design.</p> <p>Reflective supervision was called out in the lit review; I didn't see it in the logic model. This is quality assurance and is critical to evaluating the success of a program.</p> <p>Sometimes all we get for policies and procedures is a table of contents. I was really impressed with much of what was here. Part of what concerned me was that I didn't see any direction about when to use these protocols. I also need to see policies around supervision.</p> <p>The evaluation plan assesses the dose of services and client outcomes, but I don't see this in all of the evaluation questions. I think the gaps here will make it harder to know what they are assessing.</p> <p>Discussion:</p>	<p>Motion to approve Maternal Child Health Field Nursing for Tier 3 status: Jennifer</p> <p>Second: Stephen</p> <p>Yes: 8</p> <p>No: 1</p> <p>Abstain: 3</p>	<p>MCHFN will be included as a Tier 3 program in the Portfolio for 3 years.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I think we should approve but discuss what changes should be made for a Tier 2 application for this program. My concern isn't about the specific chunks that are missing, but rather about the gaps between the links between the lit review, logic model, policies and procedures and evaluation plan. Connection between the dose and outcome can be cleared up once they begin the evaluation. <p>Public Comment (Pauline provided handouts to committee members). Pauline: We made an adjustment to the logic model and reflected what we're doing under outputs to include by-weekly supervision. I've provided a document that outlines our evaluation timeline. We could include our data sheets.. We answered questions about how we track referrals. Elizabeth: We discuss dosage in the logic model under Outputs. We've given you a handout that discusses five protective factors as an effective approach to making long lasting change in families. It shows linkage between framework and activities staff are using. Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to clarify that we cannot approve the application based on these documents. Page 35 of the lit review makes it very clear that they are doing what is required for supervision. <p>Jennifer moved to approve Tier 3 Stephen seconded the motion.</p>		
Clearinghouse Review Workgroup	Staff would like to convene a workgroup to review clearinghouse standards and map them to Tier 1 and Tier 2. The committee members will review one clearinghouse as a group and a workgroup will be formed to review and map the remaining 11 clearinghouses.	None	Upstream staff members will create a matrix to facilitate the process.
Public Comment	None	None	None
Next Meeting/Final	The next meeting will be on February 18 at 490 Mendocino Ave.	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Comments			
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:00 pm.	None	None