



Wednesday, December 19, 2012 - Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 – 3:30 p.m.

3600 Westwind Blvd – Orville Wright Conf Room

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council (absent)

Christina Rivera, County Administrator’s Office (absent)

Dan Blake, Sonoma County Office of Education

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

Elizabeth Chicone, Department of Health Services

Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way of the Wine Country

Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department

Katie Greaves, Human Services Department (absent)

Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department (staff)

Leo Tacata, District Attorney’s Office

Monique Chapman, Sheriff’ Office

Marla Stuart, Human Services Department (Project Manager)

Megan Sirna, Human Services Department (staff)

Robert Judd, Community Foundation

Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa (absent)

Stephen Jackson, Sonoma County Office of Education

Susan Castillo, Department of Health Services

Members of the Public (listed alphabetically)

None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
<b>Welcome, Introductions, Agenda, Minutes</b>	Larissa welcomed the group and thanked them for all of their hard work and offered them holiday treats. She mentioned there are no reviews, so we will just be doing a training session. <b>Motion</b> to approve October 17, 2012 minutes.	Motion: Robert Judd Second: Dan Blake Ayes: 6 Nos: 0 Abstain: 2 (Susan and Steven were not at the last meeting) Absent: 5	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
<b>Reports</b>	<p>Report on Portfolio submission activity. It is the intention of staff to provide regular updates to the Committee in this format.</p> <p>Group discussed the report, as well as mentioned organizations that are in the process of applying to the portfolio.</p> <p>No reviewers wished to debrief approved applications. .</p> <p>Larissa and Marla briefed the group about the appeal that happened on December 12, 2012. State Preschool by 4C's was not accepted for tier placement at Committee. Their appeal was denied. 4Cs stated that they plan to apply for Tier 2.</p>	Leo and BJ arrived.	none
<b>Applications to the Portfolio</b>	None that required discussion at the Committee meeting.	none	none
<b>Approvals</b>	<p>New procedure for discussing applications in committee meetings.</p> <p>Will discuss next time</p>	none	none
<b>Discussion Items</b>	<p>Portfolio Review Training: The did a practice review of Safe School Ambassadors . Members had 10-15 minutes to complete a review and discussed each of the following sections.</p> <p>Literature Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Discussion of where people found the summary of what is known/not known. Although what is known and not known might not be explicitly stated, from the description it could be implied that they understood the body of the literature.</li> <li>• Problems around reviewing literature reviews comes around lack of experience with literature reviews.</li> <li>• It can also be difficult to see if program design reflects literature review – if the design of the program is not presented well. Does program design reflect literature review? OR change to Does the literature review appear to inform the program design?</li> <li>• The age of the literature is important. The literature review should include at least some current literature.</li> </ul> <p>Logic Model:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Question about assumptions: What do we expect?</li> <li>• Assumptions are not always causal; they can be general thoughts that influence what we believe. Assumptions may not be explicitly stated, but implied through the sequence of the logic model, and the indicators they were measuring.</li> </ul>	None – will vote on revisions next time	<p>Change 2E to Does the literature review appear to inform the program design?</p> <p>3E: Revise “Causal link” on score sheet</p>

	<p>Manual:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Steven said he didn't get a good sense about training, rights and responsibilities, client/staff ratio. These can be difficult to find with just table of contents. Monique agreed that there was not enough detail in table of contents to understand about staff.</li> <li>• Leo used table of contents with titles, and known page numbers (99) to trust that they covered each of the topics adequately. You can also use the number of pages for each section. Some would rather verify it was there. How do know how organizations use the manual without doing site visits? We can add: "Have you made any adaptations since this manual? What are they?"</li> <li>• What is a measurement we will use to determine if those adaptations are acceptable? Can either use or adapt adaptations for Tier 1 fidelity.</li> </ul> <p>Evaluation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Elizabeth's concern was if the evaluation related to the implementation here. If don't see where results from evaluation are reflected in program design you can and should ask for it.</li> <li>• How do they interpret their results? Are program improvements being made based on the results? We have to presume they have some understanding of their own results. Not that evaluation says it was a failure, needs to show that there was adjustment in program design.</li> <li>• Maybe need to ask for program design last.</li> </ul>		<p>If have questions when doing review, ask for full manual prior to returning your score sheet.</p> <p>Add: Have you made any adaptations since this manual? What are they?</p> <p>Remove Audience</p> <p>Ask for program design last</p> <p>Take off most and all clarifications</p> <p>Take off Unclear for main sections</p>
<b>Public comment</b>	No additional comments.	None	
<b>Adjourn</b>	Meeting adjourned at 3:07 p.m.		

**Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Dates**

*Third Wednesday of Every Month from 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.  
3600 Westwind Blvd – Orville Wright Room*