



Wednesday, February 19, 2014 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
 Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
 Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office
 Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department
 Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa
 Stephen Jackson, SCOE

Staff (listed alphabetically)

Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services Department
 Cynthia King, Human Services Department

Joni Thacher, Human Services Department
 Oscar Chavez, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
 Dan Blake, SCOE
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department

Public (listed alphabetically)

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting
 Jill Nielsen, BASSC
 John Fong, BASSC
 Liz Jimenez, Jewish Family and Children's Services
 Mella Minberg, Jewish Family and Children's Services

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Application to the Portfolio	<p>Angie welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions. We will begin the meeting with a discussion of the Girls Circle Application from Jewish Family and Children's services. Katie and Stephen reviewed the program. Today we will be discussing the Literature Review, Logic Model, Manual, and Evaluation.</p> <p>Leo recused himself.</p> <p>Katie: This is an excellent organization with exceptional programs. I am very impressed that when they realized they had a need for a peer support group they chose an evidence-based program.</p> <p>Literature Review</p> <p>Katie: While the literature review was exhaustive in regards to the needs of adoptive families I couldn't find an adequate basis in the literature to link support groups to adoption. Girls Circle is typically used for delinquent populations.</p> <p>Stephen: This was an extensive review of adoptive services and post-adoptive adaptation. Support groups and advocacy help to relieve stress and assist in obtaining resources for families. There was enough of a link between the literature and support group type of therapy for post-</p>	<p>Motion to deny Tier 2: Stephen Second: Monique Yes: 7 No: 0 Abstain: 1</p>	<p>Cynthia will provide T.A.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>adoptive families.</p> <p>The committee discussed if Girls Circle was a support group or a positive youth development program.</p> <p>Katie: The literature mention youth support groups, but it tends to be more about what the parents need. Is Jewish Family and Children’s Services investing in Girls Circle to offer pro-social pathways to steer girls away from anti-social behavior or to offer peer support? The Girls Circle peer reviewed evaluations were not for the primary purpose of peer support. We know the needs of adoptive families, but I don’t see anything that links girls who are adopted to being at a higher risk for delinquent behavior. I need to see a literature review that links Girls Circle to adoption.</p> <p>Stephen: The literature talked about problems that adoptive girls may have such as depression, malaise, etc. I think there was a connection with youth struggling through foster care that suggests these youth may have some of the issues Girls Circle addresses.</p> <p>Rob: The issue is the anti-social behavior focus. Program outcomes listed in the logic model are things that would be applicable to adoptive girls. If the program offers improvement in those areas there will be a lower likelihood of delinquency. The focus in on girls developing assets for a healthy successful life.</p> <p>Logic Model</p> <p>Katie: My concern is the same. There is no connection between adoption and delinquency.</p> <p>Stephen: I did see a connection between adoptive girls struggling with depression, self-image, etc.</p> <p>Manual</p> <p>Katie: All that was submitted was a Table of Contents. I wanted to see the content, however the weight of my concern is not with the manual.</p> <p>Stephen: I would have like a better description of staff training.</p> <p>Monique: It would be nice to have seen the Girls Circle manual included in the application.</p> <p>Evaluation</p> <p>Katie: The ultimate outcomes had to do with what they were measuring. They were measuring performance indicators in the juvenile justice system. There was no connection that adopted girls were likely to be delinquent.</p> <p>Stephen: I didn’t have those issues. It was about relating to other people, sharing feelings, and learning to express things. I did have an initial caution that the evaluation was not appropriate to the population.</p> <p>Katie: In short it was an adaptation. The target population was changed. I have no doubts regarding the effectiveness of Girls Circle, but once we have an adaptation we need to call it what it is. Common sense says this will work, but has it been studied for this population?</p>		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Monique: Is the evaluation close enough to the needs of the girls in the group to provide the same results?</p> <p>Rob: I'm nervous about calling this an adaptation. This program is used very widely and is targeted to issues that girls experience. The target population is girls not delinquent girls. All that needs to be made is a link between the issues adopted girls face and the issues the program addresses.</p> <p>Katie: Rob's point is well taken, but then we have an evaluation that suggests it has a target population. We need an evaluation that says the target population is girls.</p> <p>Liz Jimenez made a public comment. She discussed the history of The Parents' Place at Jewish Family and Children's Services, the research behind the literature review and the implications of the evaluation. She cited materials not included in the application.</p> <p>Mella Minceberg made a public comment. She emphasized that the target population was girls.</p> <p>Stephen motioned to deny Tier 2 and recommend technical assistance for the literature review and evaluation.</p> <p>Motioned passed.</p>		
Portfolio Update	<p>Cynthia provided an update of Portfolio and Technical Assistance progress.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There was concern that Seneca Wraparound had been approved as a Tier 1 program. It's on a clearinghouse, but it's not a program that could be replicated. It's actually only a group of principles. • Current instructions ask for the manual's Table of Contents only. Should we change that? If an application is denied because they didn't submit the entire manual, but one exists should the application go to committee? • We will only require the Table of Contents. If more information is needed it can be provided after the application has gone to Committee. 	None	Staff will review Seneca Wraparound and include a discussion of what can be included as a Tier 1 program on the Portfolio on a future agenda.
Public Comment	None at this time.	None	None
Next Meeting/Final Comments	The next meeting will be on March 19, 2014 at 520 Mendocino Ave unless there are no applications for review.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 2:30 pm.	None	None