![Upstream Investments logo]

Wednesday, May 15, 2013 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes
1:00 p.m. – 3:30 a.m.
3600 Westwind Blvd.

Attendees (listed alphabetically)

Alfredo Perez, First 5 Sonoma County

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting

Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council

Dan Blake, SCOE

Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department

Katie Greaves, Human Services Department

Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office

Larissa Heeren, Human Services Department (staff)

Marla Stuart, Human Services Department (project manager)

Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office

Rob Halverson, Probation Department

Robert Judd, Community Foundation

Serena Lieneau, City of Santa Rosa

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes	Introductions. **Motion** to approve the minutes	Motion: Julie Second: Robert Yes:10 No:0	None
Updates & Reports	Update report with Portfolio activities since April meeting. This may be Larissa's last meeting. She will be taking a position with the Probation Department. We will not be able to discuss El Puente today because one of the reviewers was not able to attend the meeting.	None	None
Applications	Latino Service Providers Alfredo-I had trouble I has was bridging the activities and the model. When you look at the logic model it does not match the evaluation. The evaluation was good. I don't have a problem with the quality of individual items. It is the linkages between them. BJ-I would have reviewed this differently if it were a different kind of service. It is a clearinghouse of information for Latinos. It is not direct services—If it were, I would have reviewed it differently. For the evaluation, it was good and the evaluation was appropriate for the type of model that it is. They are looking at the short term outcomes of information being provided. That is essentially what is being provided. Marla-Every program will have long term outcomes that they are not necessarily measuring. Other comments-The literature review and the evaluation do match up. The literature was up to date. The logic model does not accurately show who they are serving with their program or strategy.	Motion: BJ Second: Leo Yes: 7 No: 4 Abstain: Carlos	

Upstream Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes for 5/15/13, Sonoma County Human Services Department (565-5800)

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	They tried hard to follow our criteria. We don't have to have all the elements in the logic model. Dan-This is more of a strategy than a program. Julie-For our purposes, program is defined broadly. Marla-WHEEL is similar and it was approved. BJ-70% of their members have received mental health services. They are a professional development and information provider. There is a clearinghouse is in the outputs. The logic is there. The evaluation does measure the analytics of that information. The components are there and suitable for Tier 2. They want to expand to include long-term outcomes in their evaluation in the future but they do not currently. They are providing services to individuals and organizations. Other comments-How does the quality of the services impact the success of the model overall? They discuss how to maintain the quality and relevancy of their services. Is there anything in the evaluation about change from a baseline? You want to think about the ultimate outcomes of what you are doing, not simply your part. I am having difficulty understanding how we assess an intermediary organizations. What are the specific changes in member organizations? Make it cleaner. Who are targets? The third bullet clarifies that for me. There is no indication of the eye on the long term changes they want to achieve. Recommendation vs. referral. There are times when it is valuable to have a referral service that does not evaluate the services being referred. **Motion to approve for Tier 2**		
Accreditation	Accreditation At our last meeting, we had a conversation about what we are looking for in terms of accreditation for Tier 1 programs. We have done some more research about accreditation. 93% of evidence-based programs have no articulated fidelity measures, and to date, no program has submitted an acceptable accreditation to show fidelity for Tier 1. Considering this information, we feel it is best to remove the option accreditation as proof of fidelity to the model program. All programs will be required to fill out our fidelity matrix. There will also be a footnote instructing programs with an on-going, third-party review process to contact us prior to filling out the form. Comments Great idea! What a relief! This statistic about the lack of fidelity measures and accreditation processes is a great affirmation of why we have been struggling so much with these things. **Motion to limit proof of fidelity to the fidelity matrix.**	Motion: Katie Second: Robert Yes: 12 No: 0	
Discussion Items	Debrief • What is the difference between Tier 2 and Tier 3? What is the ladder for Tier 3 to Tier 2. Will		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	the evaluation plan lead us to the evaluation we want for Tier 2.		
	• What are the parts of our process that aren't working?		
	• Maybe we need to give them a longer response.		
	• It was circuitous.		
	• I don't feel good about that we are not coming to consensus. I am advocating for them but I am not entirely comfortable with that. I also know they put a lot of work into this and they want to do a good job. Without Upstream, they wouldn't even be doing that. This is not the be all, end all.		
	• If we are all going to discuss the application, we all need to review the applications.		
	• Having three business days is not enough time to adequately prepare.		
	• The time frame is appropriate given that we never have more than three days.		
	• What makes this unique is that we have different background. WE don't have to have consensus.		
	• We could change it to a 2/3 vote.		
	• If we have tighter criteria, hopefully we can have less split.		
	• It has to be a safe place to disagree. IT is great that we bring different perspectives.		
	• Facilitated discussion to move it forward more quickly. Maybe we need to have a little more structure.		
	• Maybe we need a tool or a flip chart.		
	• Is creating awareness enough for Tier 2?		
	• Are there different criteria for program vs. practice?		
	• Walking into this, I would have thought it would be more rigorous.		
	• We have missed an opportunity with Latino Service Providers. They are not going to change what they are doing now that they have been approved.		
	• Great programs are great programs they should be tied together.		
	• 3 people review each application. Discuss the thoughts.		
Public Comment	Wanda Tapia made public comment	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 2:44	None	None