



Wednesday, October 21, 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
- Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
- Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
- Karin Demarest, Community Foundation
- Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office
- Rebecca Wachsberg, County Administrator's Office
- 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)

- Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
- Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way
- Kate Pack, First 5
- Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
- Serena Lienau, Violence Prevention Partnership

Public (listed alphabetically)

Leah Benz, First 5

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
<b>Welcome, Introductions, Minutes – Action Item</b>	<p>Angie welcomed everyone and made announcements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Serena has taken a leave of absence until January 2016.</li> <li>• The by-laws update will be tabled because a vote with 2/3 of the committee present is required for a quorum.</li> </ul> <p>Motion to approve the minutes was made by Ellen Bauer and seconded by Monique Chapman.</p>	<p>Motion to approve the minutes:</p> <p>Yes: 7 No: 0 Abstain: 1</p>	None
<b>Updates &amp; Reports</b>	<p>Angie provided an update on new programs approved for the Portfolio since the last meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tier 1 - Mike Hauser Algebraic Academy</li> <li>• Tier 2- Breastfeeding Peer Counseling and Earn it, Keep it, Save it.</li> </ul> <p>Update: Leah Benz advised the Committee that the Behavioral Consultation Project, a program of the Early Learning Institute that provides on-site consulting services to child care centers and family care homes serving children from birth through age 5, will soon be renamed as The Consultation Project.</p> <p>Helen Simi is introduced as Upstream Investment's new administrative aide.</p>	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
<p><b>Application to the Portfolio:</b>  <b>Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Mother's Care - Action Item</b></p>	<p><b>Cognitive Behavioral Therapy, Mother's Care</b>  <b>Reviewers: All present</b>  Recusals : None</p> <p>The committee discussed an application by Mother's Care, which Monique approved and Rob denied.</p> <p>The submitter, Allison Murphy, was not able to make the meeting, so Angie will read her statement after the Committee discussion.</p> <p>Items in question: Dose/Exposure and Quality of Program Delivery  Reviewers: Rob Halverson and Monique Chapman</p> <p>Monique approved: Although Monique ultimately approved the application, she did struggle with the quality of delivery section where she would have liked to have more detail and specifics on staff and administration. In the dose and exposure section, Mother's Care kept referring to and citing a smaller dosage: it was ambiguous if they were administering at the higher or lower dosage. She ultimately approved the dosage and exposure section because they stated that they did administer at the recommended level; however, the rest of the application does not show strong support to that effect.</p> <p>Rob denied: Rob's main question of concern was in the quality area. While it was concerning that the manual was not mentioned in the application, overall, this was not a reason to deny the application. The fact that dosage was administered only at 28% was problematic enough to deny the application. Is it a quality implementation of CBT at 28%?</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• BJ: Do we evaluate a program based on what they offer or what they actually administer in their program? BJ feels that Mother's Care is adhering to the UI standards that need to be met.</li> <li>• Rob: We need to ask the follow-up question as to why the dosage and exposure are so low.</li> <li>• Julie: She could not tell from the application if the recommended dosage was being adhered to.</li> <li>• Karin: Is it ok if Mother's Care administered a shorter 12 week dose because they were</li> </ul>	<p>Motion to approve Mother's Care submission to the Portfolio as a Tier 1 Program:  Yes: 6  No: 1  Abstain: 0</p>	<p>None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>successful after 12 dosages; therefore, they did not need to administer the full 16 doses in order to see results? The issue is that we are tracking fidelity to the program and not just outcomes. It is unclear in Allison Murphy’s report how many clients did actually get the recommended dosage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Joni explains that the first 3 visits are covered by Petaluma Healthcare District and thereafter, the patient is expected to finance additional visits on their own. This is a barrier to the process.</li> </ul> <p>A written statement from Allison Murphy, MFT, was presented to the Committee: Provider offers fidelity to the clients but other factors come in to play which results in patients not receiving the full dosage. Although 16+ treatments is ideal, considerable relief can be immediately seen after just 3-6 weeks of treatment. Treatment termination is a collaborative decision between patient and provider.</p> <p>Decision: Motion to approve Mother’s Care’s application to the Portfolio as a Tier 1 program was made by Julie Sabbag-Maskey and seconded by BJ Bischoff.</p>		
<p><b>Logic Models – Purpose and Evaluation</b></p>	<p>Angie led a discussion on how to establish common expectations for logic models included in Tier 2 &amp; 3 submissions.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some reviewers believe that short-term outcomes listed in the application need to be addressed clearly in the logic model or they will get denied. Other reviewers believe that short-term outcome goals can be set, but if they have not been achieved at the time of submission, it is not grounds for an application denial. Is there any flexibility to forgo the short-term outcome measurements as long as there are intermediate outcomes being measured?</li> <li>• Ellen: 4H submitted a logic model that was taken from a national model which did not have the same short-term outcomes as their local model. The local short-term outcomes showed the program making contributions which were listed as a long-term goal in the national model. This “logic model” was not logical. How much adherence to measurement of their short-term outcomes do we require for application approval?</li> <li>• UI requires that short-term outcomes are measured. The Committee should decide where to set the threshold for measurement of short-term outcomes (i.e. how many outcomes are measured, short-term and/or intermediate).</li> </ul>	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monique: Outcomes cited in the literature review should be should be the minimum outcomes that are measured. Programs should be encouraged to list as many outcomes as they would like to take on; however, we need to ensure that the outcomes listed in the literature review are measured.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee is asked to decide if short-term outcomes can be listed in the application without being evaluated.</p> <p>Decision: All short-term outcomes do not need to be measured in order to be approved, but the program and overall evaluation need to show logic, credibility and alignment with the measured outcomes and reflected in the literature.</p> <p>Side discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rob would like to address process evaluation in the future.</li> <li>• BJ suggested we add the logic model template as a watermark on the application to provide direction on what is recommended for inputs, outputs and outcomes.</li> </ul>		
<b>Review Updated Bylaws</b>	Angie tabled this item until the next meeting or when there is at least 2/3 of the Committee present to participate in a vote on Upstream’s recommendation to include non-profit organizations in the pool of for potential PRC members.	None	This item will be added onto the next PRC agenda.
<b>Upstream Investments Funder’s Guide</b>	<p>Angie provided an overview of the Upstream Funder’s Guide to broaden the view of the Portfolio Review Committee and align the priorities of programs, reviewers and funders.</p> <p>Takeaways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to be aligned with funders in order to drive the changes in process and practice that we are committed to.</li> <li>• We provide strong support and encouragement to build funder capacity.</li> <li>• Funders are asked to help grantees strengthen their infrastructure, including their capacity to evaluate.</li> <li>• Funders and grantees need to recognize that being on the Portfolio is not appropriate for all programs and is not an end in itself.</li> <li>• We want to provide ways for Upstream principles and tools to be incorporated into grantees’ programs.</li> </ul>		

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>
	Discussion: BJ will provide the names of some rotary clubs that would be ideal candidates to present to about Upstream as potential funders.		
<b>Public Comment</b>	None	None	None
<b>Next Meeting/Final Comments</b>	The next meeting will be held on November 18, 2015.	None	None
<b>Adjourn</b>	Adjourned at 3:00 pm.	None	None