



Wednesday, March 18, 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
 Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
 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
 Kate Pack, First 5
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
 Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office
 Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department

Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa
 Stephen Jackson, SCOE

Staff (listed alphabetically)

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

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Rebecca Wachsberg, County Administrator's Office

Public (listed alphabetically)

Kris Montgomery, Human Services Department
 Megan Sirna, Human Services Department

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, Updates	Angie welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions of new staff including Liz Parra, Administrative Aide. Angie also introduced Megan Sirna, READY Coordinator for the Department of Human Services. Megan will serve on the Portfolio Review Committee beginning in April. Motion to approve the minutes. Stephen arrived after the minutes were approved.	Motion to approve the minutes: Yes: 13 No: 0 Abstain: 0	None
Updates & Reports	Angie provided an application and training update.	None	None
Application to the Portfolio – THP Plus,	Transitional Housing Program, Tier 2 Promising Practices Elements for discussion: Reviewers: Julie and Leo Recusals: Katie and Stephen Julie: The policy briefs were considered in addition to renewal information. I reviewed these documents and approved the application based this additional information.	Motion chart. Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 2	Staff will provide TA to impacted organizations.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Leo: Evaluated on what was submitted and did not take into consideration the Policy Brief that Julie found online. As reviewers we should not have to go out of our way to find additional information. Additionally, three of the outcomes do not align with what is being measured.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical assistance should advise to include only short-term outcomes that are evaluated. • Should we be evaluating only what is submitted? <p>Leo: The application stands on the merits on what was submitted, regardless of whether its renewal application. The organization should updated their logic model to reflect only evaluated outcomes and submit the 2012 Policy Brief as their most recent evaluation.</p> <p>Monique moved to deny renewal and recommended technical assistance. Carlos seconded the motion. Motion to deny the renewal passed.</p>		
<p>Renewal Standards</p>	<p>Joni introduced the discussion on renewal standards for Tier 2 evaluations.</p> <p>Joni provided examples of two programs that were submitted for renewal that demonstrated a different level of rigor.</p> <p>Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What are our current criteria for Tier 2 evaluations? • Are these criteria meaningful and effective? • Do we need to revise our criteria for Tier 2 renewal evaluations? • What is the expectation for the organization at their second renewal? (6 years on the Portfolio) <p>Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Over time we want to see that the evaluation is impacting programming. • Organizations must demonstrate movement on the evidence continuum. • Tier 3 is held to higher standard than Tier 2 – Why? • Is Tier 2 really evidenced - based? • There is funder/community trust of the Portfolio to maintain. • Is looking at, or requiring local data our charge? 	<p>None</p>	<p>Staff will create criteria and clarify renewal options.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second renewals should include outcomes, but not a full evaluation. • Is looking at, or requiring local data our charge? • Communicate the need to change standards in order to help clarify them. <p>The Committee outlined the following options:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. No data, no evaluation plan required for Tier 2 renewals 2. At first renewal, require and evaluation plan with the expectation of data at the 2nd renewal 3. Require data at the first Tier 2 renewal. 		
Evaluation Time Frame	This item was tabled		
Public Comment	None	None	None
Next Meeting/Final Comments	<p>Angie and the Portfolio Review Committee thanked Stephen Jackson for his work on the Portfolio Review Committee</p> <p>The next meeting will be on April 15 at 490 Mendocino Ave.</p>	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:00 pm.	None	None