



**Wednesday October 17, 2012 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes**

1:00 – 3:30 p.m.

1202 Apollo Way, Santa Rosa, CA, Annadel Room

**Attendees (listed alphabetically)**

Christina Rivera, County Administrator’s Office

Dan Blake, Sonoma County Office of Education

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

Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way of the Wine Country

Julie Sabbag-Maskey, First 5 Sonoma County

Leo Tacata, District Attorney’s Office

Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department (staff)

Marla Stuart, Human Services Department (Project Manager)

Megan Sirna, Human Services Department (staff)

Monique Chapman, Sheriff’s Office

Robert Judd, Community Foundation

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>
<b>Welcome, Introductions, Minutes</b>	<p><b>Motion to approve the September minutes with the changes listed below.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Carol Simmons was not present at the meeting.</li> <li>• Julie recused herself because First 5 provides funding to this agency for preschool related services.</li> <li>• Bachelor’s degrees are required by 2020.</li> <li>• We require that for Tier 1, if accreditation is required by the model program, we require that the Sonoma County implementation participates in the accreditation. If the model program does not require participation, the application should provide evidence that it is not required.</li> </ul>	<p>Move: Jennifer            Second: Julie            Ayes: 8            Noes: 0</p>	<p>Post final minutes to sonomaupstream.org</p>
<b>Reports</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update on Portfolio Activity since last meeting. Report provided.</li> <li>• Debrief approved applications. Guiding Good Choices and Seeking Safety were approved. Reviewers of these applications provided brief descriptions of the programs to the committee.</li> <li>• A question was raised about the possibility of creating a waiting period for submitting a new application when an application for the same program has been denied.</li> </ul>	<p>Place on agenda for next meeting</p>	<p>Place on agenda for next meeting</p>
<b>Application to the Portfolio</b>	<p><b>Scholarship Sonoma County / 10,000 Degrees</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scholarship Sonoma County / 10,000 Degrees was submitted by the Community Foundation of Sonoma County for Tier 2 and reviewed by Leo Tacata and Serena Lienau. Scholarship Sonoma County was discussed at the September meeting of the Review Committee and the consensus was for no tier placement. A response was provided by the applicant and the reviewers again disagreed on tier placement,</li> </ol>	<p>Motion: Christina            Second: B.J.            Ayes: 4            Noes: 2</p>	<p>None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>necessitating that it come to committee again.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. This program aims to encourage post-secondary accomplishments among low-income students by providing academic, emotional and financial support to participants.</li> <li>3. Robert recused himself because he works for the applicant agency. Jennifer recused herself because her agency funds and sits on the Board for the applicant program. Stephen recused himself because he works with the applicant on outreach for this program.</li> <li>4. Leo identified the following issue which had not been satisfied by the response: The evaluation submitted was an executive summary and did not include a literature review or reference to a literature review.</li> <li>5. It is necessary for the committee to vote because Serena is not present. Committee members were provided a copy of the evaluation and the response given to the reviewers. Discussion about the extent to which the literature review informed the application.</li> </ol> <p><b>6. Motion to approve for tier placement.</b> Public comment was made by Lisa Carreño.</p>		
<b>Criteria Revisions</b>	None	None	None
<b>Discussion Items</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>November meeting date</u>: There is no quorum for the November 21<sup>st</sup> meeting. This meeting will be canceled in accordance with the Brown Act and Review Committee Bylaws. If there is a quorum for the December 19<sup>th</sup> meeting, that meeting date will stand. If not, an alternate date will be proposed in either November or December.</li> <li>• <u>Upstream Champions</u>: Committee members are often in the position of Upstream Champions. Members doing a great job and staff would like to know what your response from people has been and how we might better support you in your role as champions. Committee members shared that they are usually talking to people who have never heard of Upstream and that it would be nice to have a brochure to give out about the Portfolio. They also mentioned that they often direct people to the website but that the website has room for improvement.</li> <li>• BJ shared some information from a workshop that she put on as president of Impact 100. Marla, Larissa, and Leo participated in the section of the workshop focused on developing logic models. B.J. hopes that the logic model will be a required component of the Impact 100 grant next year.</li> <li>• <u>Process improvement</u>: Often when applications come to the committee for discussion, the applications are very frequently denied by the two reviewers. It seems that there is pressure</li> </ul>		<p>Cancel the November meeting according to our process Improve website and provide additional resources to committee members</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>for the approving reviewer to concede to the other. While it is acceptable to deny applications, this is an observation that has caused us to question our process. Some options are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making the question posed by the denying reviewer public before the meeting. This would allow the other reviewer to prepare a response to that question and would allow the applicant to know what part of their application is to be discussed.</li> <li>• Currently, the committee only votes on tier placement when the reviewers cannot come to consensus about tier placement. Rather than allowing time for the two reviewers to come to consensus, the review committee could vote on all applications that come to committee. This would free the reviewers from the need to agree or disagree with the other reviewer.</li> </ul> <p>The Committee agreed to try both of these things at the next meeting. In order to do so, proposed amendments to the Application, Review, Decision and Appeal Process will need to be approved prior to the discussion of portfolio applications.</p>		Put this as an action at the beginning of the next agenda
<b>Public Comment</b>	No additional public comment.	None	None
<b>Adjourn</b>	Adjourned at 2:45 p.m.	None	None

### Upstream Investments Portfolio Review Committee Upcoming Meetings

November 21<sup>st</sup>, 2012

December 19<sup>th</sup>, 2012

January 16<sup>th</sup>, 2013—1202 Apollo Way in the Annadel Room

February 20<sup>th</sup>, 2013

March 20<sup>th</sup>, 2013

April 17<sup>th</sup>, 2013