



Wednesday, December 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
 Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
 Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
 Karin Demarest, Community Foundation
 Leah Benz, First 5
 Monique Chapman, Sheriff’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)

Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
 Rebecca Wachsberg, County Administrator’s Office
 Serena Lienau, Violence Prevention Partnership

Public (listed alphabetically)

Socorro Shiels, Santa Rosa City Schools

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes – Action Item	Angie welcomed everyone and introduced Leah Benz as a Board approved member of the Portfolio Review Committee. Motion to approve the October minutes was made by BJ Bischoff and seconded by Karin Demarest.	Motion to approve the minutes: Yes: 9 No: 0 Abstain: 0	None
Updates & Reports	Angie provided an update on new programs approved for the Portfolio since the last meeting: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1 – A Matter of Balance (renewal), Sonoma County Human Services Dpt.; and Seeking Safety (renewal), Women’s Recovery Services • Tier 2 – Sonoma County 4-H STEM, University of CA Cooperative Extension 	None	None
Application to the Portfolio: Aggression Replacement Training, Seneca – Action Item	Aggression Replacement Training (ART), Seneca Reviewers: All present Recusals : Rob Halverson The committee discussed the ART application by Seneca, which Karin approved and Julie denied. Angie referred to the Acceptable Adaptations section on the Portfolio Application	Motion to recommend Aggression Replacement Training for Technical Assistance: Yes: 8	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Instructions (page 8) and introduced an article regarding acceptable vs risky adaptations as related to program fidelity. Adhering to program replication is a key factor when taking into consideration acceptable adaptations.</p> <p>A representative of the submitter organization, Seneca, was not able to attend the meeting, so Angie will read their formal statement after the Committee discussion.</p> <p>Items in question: Adherence, Does/exposure, Quality of Program Delivery and Adaptions. Reviewers: Karin Demarest and Julie Sabbag-Maskey.</p> <p>Rob Halverson recused himself from this discussion and decision.</p> <p>Jennifer: Is it acceptable if an adaption to a program is made and outcomes are actually measured to show the adaption, such as lowering the dosage, still works?</p> <p>Karin approved: Karin approved the application based on the Crosswalk of Clearinghouses that she was given. Neither clearinghouse provided for reference was robust. However, on further reflection, the issue of dosage (2/week vs 3/week as recommended for fidelity) is of concern. The dosage is also not provided in equal amounts to other skill sets. Karin is now on the fence as she considers that the implementer did not use the original curriculum as a reference for their adaptation, and instead, used an outside source.</p> <p>Julie denied: Julie also found the clearinghouse was meager, but the link to the developer had more information on which she based her review. She noticed that the Social Skills Training was not in the original curriculum which triggered her to dig deeper into the program's fidelity. Adaptions appeared to be skewed to focus on skills development and were not split up equally amongst other skill sets that the ART program states are more/equally important.</p> <p>Angie read a written statement from Seneca to the Committee: Seneca has been a high quality implementer of ART in Sonoma County since 2012, strictly adhering to the structure of this evidence-based program. Seneca's statement addresses the 4 areas of concern raised by Julie and ultimately resulted in the program's application denial.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Social Skills Training is 1 of 3 core components of ART. • There is no program drift. They integrate the entire 50-skill curriculum, including the 10 core skills. 	<p>No: 0 Abstain: 1</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All facilitators complete a comprehensive accreditation process in compliance with ART structure and requirements. • Seneca’s adaptations for dose/exposure were approved by CIBHS and the Sonoma County Probation Department, both of whom recognize Seneca’s ART program as a fully model-adherent and evidence-based practice. <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Karin voiced concern that the sessions are provided at 45 min/45 min/1.5 hour durations vs 1 hour sessions, 3 times/week. There is also not an explanation of how CIBHS is related to the program developer and if they have the authority to approve these adaptations. • Julie states that even if they received approval of the adaptations from CIBHS, it was an agreement between funder and implementer and not a certainty. Also, the original program focuses on only 10 of the 50 skills in the curriculum vs Seneca’s focus on all 50 skills. Is there a reason why the original developer designed the program to drill down on only 10 of the 50 skills? • BJ has concerns on why the dosages were changed and that there was no evidence behind the effectiveness of these adaptations on dosage. • Karin believes that the reason this application yielded one approval and one denial is a result of 2 different approaches to reviewing the application. This is an item we should review at a later date to help provide more consistency to the review process. • If there are issues around adaptation, the onus should be on the applicant to submit thorough and appropriate documents and resources for the reviewers to have at their disposal, instead of leaving it up to the reviewers to dig up the information. • Ultimately, the Committee agrees that if a program received approval on an adaptation from the developer than that would be acceptable. <p>Seneca needs to address 2 issues:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adaptations to the dosage need to be approved by the program developer; • Documentation on the appropriateness and effectiveness in coverage of a 50 skill curriculum vs drilling down on the 10 core skills. <p>Jennifer recommends TA or resubmitted as a different Tier program.</p> <p>Decision: Motion to deny Seneca’s application of ART to the Portfolio as a Tier 1 program was</p>		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>made by Jennifer O’Donnell and seconded by Karin Demarest.</p> <p>After a motion has been finalized by the Committee, Rob provides some additional insight: The program developers have passed away and CIBHS is sole authorized body to approve program changes.</p> <p>In the future, a recommendation to TA for approval from the developer should also include language that an authorizing body is also acceptable.</p> <p>The Committee suggests that an “Acceptable vs Risky Adaptations” checklist be built into the application.</p>		
<p>Update Bylaws – Action Item</p>	<p>Upstream staff recommends the Bylaws are updated to 1) increase the time allotted for reviews from 10 days to 30 days; and 2) add 2 memberships for local service agencies/non-profit organizations.</p> <p>Recommended changes to the bylaws:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Page 2, Section II, Item A(1)(b): Julie and Monique recommend leaving on child support services department as potential committee members. • Page 3, Section II, Item A(1)(e): Julie recommends striking the language “who do not have or intend to submit a program to the Portfolio.” • Page 3, Section II, Item A(1)(g): Julie recommends striking the language “with specific expertise in research and evaluation methodology.” • Page 3, Section II, Item A(1)(i): Add 2 membership seats for local service agencies. Members prefer that the term “non-profit organizations” be used, instead of “service agencies.” • Page 3, Section II, Item A(2)(b): Strike the language “as many Portfolio submissions each year as needed” and replace with “one Portfolio application each month”; increase the review time from “5 business” to “30 calendar ”days; change the approximate application review time from “one hour” to “one (1) to three (3) hours.” • Page 5, Section III, Item A(3): Replace “5 business days” with “30 calendar days” to correlate with the new allotted application review time suggested in Section II above. • Page 6, Section IV, Item C: Increase the timeframe for reviewers to return their Tier Placement Recommendation from “ten (10) business” to “thirty (30) calendar” days; change the approximate application review time from “one hour” to “one (1) to three 	<p>Motion to approve the Bylaws revisions as discussed herein, including the addition of 2 membership seats for local service agencies and the adoption of a 1 calendar month timeframe for Portfolio application reviews: Yes: 9 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	<p>None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>(3) hours.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Page 6, Section V, Item B(2): Replace the old website address (www.SonomaUpstream.org) with the current website address (www.upstreaminvestments.org). <p>Decision: Motion to approve the Bylaws revision as described above and to allow non-profit organizations to apply for membership to the PRC was made by Karin Demarest and seconded by Ellen Bauer.</p>		
Public Comment	None	None	None
Next Meeting/Final Comments	The next meeting will be held on January 20, 2016.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 2:15 pm.	None	None