



Wednesday, September 16, 2015 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Conference Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

- B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting
- Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
- Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way
- Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
- Karin Demarest, Community Foundation
- Kate Pack, First 5
- Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
- Megan Sirna, Human Services Department
- Rob Halverson, Probation Department

Staff (listed alphabetically)

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

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

- Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
- Monique Chapman, Sheriff’s Office
- Rebecca Wachsberg, County Administrator’s Office
- Serena Lienau, Violence Prevention Partnership

Public (listed alphabetically)

- Leah Benz, First 5

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes	Angie welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions. Motion to approve the minutes was made by Jennifer O’Donnell and seconded by Julie Sabbag-Maskey.	Motion to approve the minutes: Yes: 9 No: 0 Abstain: 0	None
Updates & Reports	Angie provided an update of Technical Assistance since the last meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 new programs approved for the Portfolio: University of CA Cooperative Extension, Teen Services Sonoma and St. Joseph’s Health. • Teen Services Sonoma did not receive TA because their application was stellar and did not need formal TA. They received help from BJ Bischoff. Rob stated he appreciated that their app set a goal to be ready for Tier 2 in 3 years. 	None	None
Reviewer Capacity - Action Item	The committee discussed a proposed timeline for reviewing submissions and returning recommendations. Upstream has provided great TA and outreach which has allowed for a greater flow of applications to be received and reviewed, creating an increase in workload for the	Motion to implement the 4 recommendations as procedure:	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>reviewers.</p> <p>Staff suggested implementing the following 4 procedures to aide with the increasing number of applications submitted for review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1) <i>Upstream will accept complete submissions to the Portfolio by the first business day of every month.</i> Discussion: This would help staff and reviewers schedule time to complete their application reviews. Some questions to consider are: Would denied applications need to be resubmitted only on the 1st of month as well? Would this count as the reviewers' monthly review or would they review this application again in addition to a new application for the month? The 1st of the month due date will be a "no later than" date. Applications will receive priority on a "first come, first serve" basis for the 6 applications being reviewed each month. • 2) <i>Applications will be packaged by staff and sent to reviewers within 5 business days of receipt.</i> This recommendation seemed straight forward and the committee had no discussions for clarifications around this. • 3) <i>Reviewers will have until the last business day of each month to complete the review and return their recommendation to staff.</i> Discussion: This would require a commitment from the reviewers to meet this deadline. Although reviewers do not need a full month to do the review, it will give them flexibility on when to fit it into their schedules. • 4) <i>A max of 6 apps per month will be reviewed; monthly excess over 6 will roll over to the next month.</i> Discussion: This would make for 1 application or renewal review a month per person. Although increasing the number of applications reviewed to 2 per month would help prevent a possible backlog, it is better to keep the application review to 1 per month to ensure reviewers can consistently keep pace since reviewers' availability fluctuates monthly. Moreover, there can be increased time requirements when reviewing Tier 2 and 3 applications. <p>Side discussion: Angie advised we are trying to gain other PCR members (up to 15) and will consider reaching out to community-based organizations. This could be a potential conflict of interest; however, the review committee does not believe that would create a problem. Reviewers can recuse themselves from reviewing apps which may be in direct competition for grants.</p> <p>Decision: To try all 4 staff recommendations presented. Motion to implement the recommendations as procedure made by Katie Greaves and seconded by BJ Bischoff.</p>	<p>Yes: 9 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Clearinghouse Criteria - Action Item	<p>Angie led a discussion on what factors constitute the definition of clearinghouse. The links for online resources were provided. The resources online include 2 types of clearinghouse definitions: 1) Systematic Review of Evidence and 2) NO Systematic Review of Evidence. All programs approved into the Portfolio currently fall into type 1. Stanford Patient Education Research Center falls under type 2 as a curriculum developer.</p> <p>Discussion: The Committee reviewed the established criteria for a clearinghouse based on type 1 and type 2 definitions presented by Staff. The Committee believes that the Upstream model's guiding principal leads us to accept the type 1 definition and organization that fall under type 2 do not qualify as an approved clearinghouse.</p> <p>A Motion was made by Carlos and seconded by Jennifer O'Donnell to accept the type 1 definition and reject the type 2 definition to approve an organization as a clearinghouse.</p> <p>Therefore, based on the approved type 1 criteria, the Stanford Patient Education Center was reviewed to see if it qualifies as a clearinghouse.</p> <p>A Motion was made by Jennifer O'Donnell and seconded by Julie Sabaag Maskey to deny approval of Stanford Patient Education Center as an Upstream approved clearinghouse.</p> <p>Joni led a discussion to decide if the ADA should be recognized as a clearinghouse. She provided an overview of their practices. She notes that the ADA charges \$1,100 for review of application for DSME approved program. BJ states she has no problem that they charge for the reviews.</p> <p>The Committee has no concerns regarding the ADA remaining as a clearinghouse.</p>	<p>Motion to accept the type 1 definition and reject the type 2 definition to approve an organization as a clearinghouse: Yes: 9 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p> <p>Motion to deny approval of Stanford Patient Education Research Center as an Upstream approved clearinghouse: Yes: 10 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	None
Public Comment	None	None	None
Next Meeting/Final Comments	The next meeting will be held on October 21, 2015.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:00 pm.	None	None