



Wednesday, July 18, 2012 - Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 – 3:30 p.m.

3725 Westwind Blvd – Carnelian Room

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council

Christina Rivera, County Administrator’s Office

Dan Blake, Sonoma County Office of Education

Dr. B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting

Elisabeth Chicoine, Department of Health Services

Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way of the Wine Country

Leo Tacata, District Attorney’s Office

Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department

Megan Sirna, Human Services Department

Monique Chapman, Sheriff’ Office

Marla Stuart, Human Services Department (Project Manager)

Robert Judd, Community Foundation

Stephen Jackson, Sonoma County Office of Education

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Agenda, Minutes	<p>Motion to approve minutes with the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spelling error ‘weather’ on first page, welcome section. <p>Changes in bylaws discussion: A. 2. A Portfolio Review Committee members will recuse themselves from any review, discussion or vote if they feel they cannot be objective or to avoid the appearance of <u>impropriety</u> <u>conflict</u>.</p>	<p>Motion: Carol Second: B.J. Ayes: 8</p>	<p>None</p>
Reports	<p>Elisabeth Chicoine arrived.</p> <p>Report out on the Appeal Committee Meeting: Seeking Safety’s appeal of the Review Committee decision was denied by the Appeal Committee. Seeking Safety has since been listed on the CA Evidence-Based Clearinghouse as an __ and the applicant has been approved for Tier 1.</p> <p>Update on Portfolio Activity since last meeting.</p> <p>Debrief of approved submissions: The committee will now have this standing agenda item. This is an opportunity for them to discuss submissions that have been completed and raise any questions.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>None</p>
Applications to the Portfolio	<p><u>Cooperative Parenting and Divorce</u></p> <p>Stephen and Jennifer were the two reviewers. They came to consensus that the manual still lacking information on staff training, client recruitment and program evaluation.</p>	<p>Consensus on no tier placement</p>	<p>Provide technical assistance to PPSC</p>
Approvals Approvals	<p>The Acceptable Clearinghouses document has been updated to include wested.org and casel.org as websites which are <u>not</u> approved as acceptable clearinghouses. Both of these sites conduct their own research in a consultant capacity but do not review the research of others.</p> <p>Motion to approve additions to the Clearinghouses list.</p> <p>Bylaws: The BOS Code of Conduct states that a board member who is recusing themselves will leave the</p>	<p>Motion: Dan Second: Elisabeth Ayes: 10</p> <p>No action taken</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>room while the item in question is deliberated. After consulting with County Counsel, it has been determined that this is not necessary for Portfolio Review Committee members. No change to the Review Committee Bylaws is needed and no action was taken.</p> <p>Criteria Revisions <u>Clarification of Fidelity for Tier 1 programs:</u> The current criteria for Tier 1 are silent on whether or not outside fidelity monitoring is required when the program developer does not require it but provides optional fidelity monitoring. Concerns about the cost of this fidelity monitoring were expressed. Other concerns about programs self-evaluating their fidelity were expressed. The group came to agreement on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If the model program requires accreditation, we require the same. 2. If the program offers voluntary accreditation or does not offer accreditation, applicants are not required to submit proof of accreditation but they must demonstrate fidelity to the model. <p>Motion to approve fidelity monitoring clarification for Tier 1. <u>Fidelity for Tiers 2 and 3:</u> Manual: After a brief discussion about whether or not Tier 2 and 3 applicants should be required to prove fidelity to their manual, the group decided to make no change to this criterion. Evaluation: The current standard is that Tier 2 applicants must submit an evaluation for a program but are not required to demonstrate fidelity to the evaluated model. The group agreed that this is an important requirement. Some members expressed a desire to require fidelity to <u>any</u> evaluation submitted but it was decided that more information is needed about what standards the acceptable evidence-based clearinghouses hold related to this issue before coming to a decision. Motion to apply fidelity criteria to outside* evaluations submitted with Tier 2 applications. *An outside evaluation is any evaluation <u>not</u> conducted on the agency or implementation being submitted. For evaluations of the submitting agency's implementation, fidelity is <u>not</u> required.</p>	<p>Motion: Robert Second: Carol Ayes: 10</p> <p>Motion: Stephen Second: Jennifer Ayes: 10</p>	<p>Update forms</p> <p>Inquire with Clearinghouses regarding their current standards for re-evaluation of programs they have approved.</p>
Discussion Items	<u>Fidelity Criteria:</u> Members expressed a desire to clarify the criteria for fidelity in some way. Marla said these are criteria developed by First 5 and that she would discuss this issue with them.	None	Contact First 5
Public comment	None.	None	None
Adjourn	Meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m. Next meeting will be August 15th, 2012 at 3600 Westwind Blvd.	None	None

Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Schedule

Third Wednesday of Every Month from 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.

3600 Westwind Blvd – Orville Wright Room