



Wednesday, August 15th, 2012 - Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 – 3:30 p.m.

3600 Westwind Blvd – Orville Wright Room

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council

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

Julie Sabbag-Maskey, First 5 Sonoma County

Katie Greaves, Human Services Department

Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office

Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department (staff)

Megan Sirna, Human Services Department(staff)

Monique Chapman, Sheriff' Office

Marla Stuart, Human Services Department (Project Manager)

Robert Judd, Community Foundation

Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa

Stephen Jackson, Sonoma County Office of Education

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Agenda, Minutes	Meetings begin as soon as there is a quorum. Motion to approve July 18, 2012 minutes. Serena, Katie and Julie abstained from the approval of the minutes as they were not in attendance at the July meeting.	Motion: Monique Second: Jennifer Ayes: 9 Noes: 0 Abstain: Julie, Katie, and Serena	None
Reports	Update on Portfolio Activity since last meeting. Debrief of approved submissions: Julie provided comments on the Somatic Experiencing application, which was recently approved for Tier 3. B.J. commented on the WHEEL Plus application which was also recently approved for Tier 3.	None	None
Applications to the Portfolio	<u>Cooperative Parenting and Divorce-Final Review</u> Stephen and Jennifer were the two reviewers. Jennifer approved this application for Tier 2 and Stephen did not. They came to consensus that the manual was still unclear with regard to the procedures for staff training, client recruitment and program evaluation specifically for Cooperative Parenting and Divorce. It was agreed that when reviewers are not clear on an item, they do not approve the application. Further it was agreed that requiring applicants to more clearly label each component of their manual would be helpful. Lastly there was agreement that the Portfolio Review Committee does not need as much information as a funder might need about a program and therefore there is no need for site visits. Consensus on no tier placement.	Consensus on no tier placement	Inform PPSC of their right to appeal

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p><u>Partners for Change Outcomes Management System-Final Review</u> The reviewers were Monique and Christina. When either of the reviewers are not present or are no longer on the committee, a vote will be taken. Christina stated on her score sheet that she was not comfortable approving the program because she was unable to understand the implication of the evaluation. It is not necessary that the reviewers understand the details of the analysis for evaluations, only that they understand the summary of results and that they can determine these are positive. For the PCOMS evaluation, there was an indication of positive results. Motion to approve PCOMS for Tier 2.</p> <p><u>CARES Plus-First Review</u> Several people recused themselves from the discussion of this application: Carol recused herself because her department is the applicant. Elisabeth recused herself. She is a member of the Child Care Planning Council and an implementer associated with the Council. Julie recused herself. Her agency funds CARES Plus. Dan and Stephen stated that while the Child Care Planning Council is part of the Sonoma County Office of Education, they do not feel they have a conflict of interest due to the large size of the agency and their limited knowledge of this program. Katie and Robert were the two reviewers for this application. Katie approved the program for tier placement and Robert did not due to concerns with the logic model and the manual. After discussion, both reviewers agreed that the logic model should be revised to be more specific and include assumptions and/or environmental factors. Regarding the manual, both reviewers agreed that it was unclear which elements were present and requested that the sections meeting the Portfolio criteria be labeled by the applicant. Public comment: Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council (commented as member of the public). Consensus on no tier placement.</p> <p><u>California Safe and Healthy Families-Final Review</u> Serena and Julie were the two reviewers. Serena approved this application for Tier 2 and Julie did not. They came to consensus that the application was not sufficient because the program implementation did not match what is expected based on the manual and the evaluation. Consensus on no tier placement.</p>	<p>Motion: Katie Second: Julie Ayes: 12 Noes: 0 Abstain: 0</p> <p>Consensus on no tier placement.</p> <p>Consensus on no tier placement.</p>	<p>Notify applicant.</p> <p>Provide technical assistance to the Child Care Planning Council</p> <p>Inform SCAYD of their right to appeal</p>
Criteria Revisions	<p>Fidelity for Tier 2: At the last meeting of the Review Committee, a vote was taken to require fidelity to the evaluated program from Tier 2 applications. Staff raised the following considerations regarding this new criterion.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This would make the Tier 2 application significantly more difficult for agencies to complete. 	<p>Motion: Dan Second: Stephen Ayes: 12 Noes: 0</p>	<p>Update forms and instructions.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>More difficult, in fact than a Tier 1 application.</p> <p>2. This may necessitate the need for a legacy program, whereby programs approved before this time are described as having achieved a lower standard than programs approved afterwards.</p> <p>Staff suggested that rather than requiring the full fidelity matrix for Tier 2 applications, the Tier 2 application and score sheet include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does the evaluation suggest positive outcomes? 2. Is the program consistent with the program evaluated? <p>Committee members agreed that this was an acceptable solution.</p> <p>Motion to add consistency of program design with the evaluation as a criterion for approval of Tier 2 applications.</p>	Abstain: 0	
Discussion Items	Frequency of Re-Evaluation: Larissa is working on a report of how frequently evidence-based clearinghouses re-evaluate programs listed on their websites. There has not be sufficient response at this time to make this report.	None	Bring report to committee when complete.
Summary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When reviewers are not clear on an item, they do not approve the application. • Requiring applicants to more clearly label each component of their manual would be helpful. • The Portfolio Review Committee does not need as much information as a funder might need about a program and therefore there is no need for site visits. • Tier 2 evaluations must suggest positive outcomes and should be consistent with the program description. 		
Public comment	No additional public comments were made.	None	None
Adjourn	Meeting adjourned. Next meeting will be September 19th, 2012 at 3725 Westwind Blvd. in the Topaz Room.	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