



**Wednesday, May 21, 2014 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes**

**1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.**

**520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room**

**Members (listed alphabetically)**

Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University  
 Ellen Bauer, Department of Health  
 Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way  
 Karin Demarest, Community Foundation  
 Kate Pack, First 5  
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department  
 Leo Tacata, District Attorney’s Office  
 Monique Chapman, Sheriff’s Office  
 Rebecca Wachsberg, Probation Department  
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department  
 Stephen Jackson, SCOE

**Staff (listed alphabetically)**

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

**Not Present (listed alphabetically)**

Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council  
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department  
 Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa

**Public (listed alphabetically)**

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting  
 Juan Hernandez, La Luz  
 Kara Reyes, La Luz  
 Ulla Mast, Department of Health Services

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>Decision</b>	<b>Next Steps</b>
<b>Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, Updates</b>	Angie welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions. Motion to approve the minutes. Cynthia provided an update of recent technical assistance and programs added to the Portfolio.	Motion to approve the minutes: Jennifer Second: Carlos Yes: 11 No: 0 Abstain: 0	None
<b>Application to the Portfolio</b>	<b>La Luz – Triple P</b> <b>Items for discussion: Missing fidelity measures</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Session-by-session guides</li> <li>• Other quality assurance processes including access to practitioner’s website, technical assistance and consultation for organizations, quality assurance processes for trainers, and level 4 coordinator’s website.</li> </ul> Rob thanked La Luz for their application and for participating in the review processes. He	Motion to approve La Luz as an implementer of Triple P. Motion: Jennifer Second: Carlos Yes : 11 No: 0	La Luz will be included as a Triple P implementer in the Upstream Portfolio.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>articulated that this was a very strong application, however when compared to the requirements listed on the California Evidence Based Clearinghouse he was concerned that the fidelity measures listed above were missing. Rob read the specific requirements as they are articulated on the California Evidence Based Clearinghouse. His greatest concern was for the use of protocol checklists.</p> <p>Kate felt this was a strong application and that some of the things missing were access issues. The application specifies that standard forms are used which implies that La Luz has the necessary website access.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> The discussion of support groups in the application suggests that they have quality processes in place. The information is in the Adherence section instead of the Quality section.</p> <p><b>Public Comment:</b> <b>Juan</b> thanked the committee and described the implementation of Triple P at La Luz. <b>Kara</b> provided specific information on the use of session-by-session guides, website access, technical assistance and consultation, quality assurance for trainers, and the use of coordinator’s website. She confirmed that even though they were not spelled out in the application all of these measures were consistently used/practiced.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> <b>Rob</b> – I had no knowledge that these things were happening. Can we recommend that the application be amended an approved? <b>Jennifer</b> – I move that we recommend the program for Tier 1. <b>Carlos</b> - I want to commend both reviewers. It can be difficult not to approve a program and reading between the lines and getting down to the nitty gritty is challenging but necessary. I would hope that the bar for Triple P and the Tier 1 programs be consistently raised. I second Jennifer’s motion. <b>Motion passed.</b></p> <p><b>Summary: La Luz was approved as an implementer of Triple P Positive Parenting.</b></p>	Abstain: 0	
<b>Tier 2 Impact</b>	<p>1:25 B.J. arrived</p> <p>How do we define “significant impact?” What is the level of impact we require for a Tier 2 program?</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b> Score sheets require that the evaluation “suggests positive outcomes.”</p>	None	Staff will make recommendations for alternate Tier divisions and for language to help Tier

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Is there something in the logic model that shows a long term impact? Can research be done on what clearinghouses expect?</p> <p>This is a difficult discussion without context. The context and rigor of research are critical. Without statistical measure this is at the reviewer’s discretion. In some cases a 2% change may be enough. In others, maybe not. We would like to think that as we move into evidence based practice we would use science to inform this decision. What should follow is training on how to do this.</p> <p>Maybe we should divide Tier 2 into those that have rigor and those that are still learning.</p> <p>Even if we use science to inform our decisions there will still be a large margin for subjectivity. Some outcomes show strong change, others less. How do I decide which ones are relevant? There is a large margin for subjectivity based on individual programs. Maybe we need a set of guidelines based on approved programs.</p> <p>If Tier 2 can include a P value that’s great, but I would be hesitant to require that. Many organizations will not have the capacity or software to do that. There should be rational around why we should accept small improvements and it should be rooted in the literature. Without adding burden for finding quantitative literature I think we may need to accept any positive change.</p> <p>TA should include what a good qualitative and quantitative study is. You can calculate P value online; we need to help people understand what that is.</p> <p>We need to remember that we are a small county built of small programs. Statistical significance is a good standard but there are other ways to articulate the importance of a good outcome. This is a learning process for our community.</p> <p>I think we need to require that they make a case about why their impact is important. Applications should show why something is meaningful. If we’re thinking about investors in the community we want them to invest soundly.</p> <p>Donors consistently ask what is the impact and how are they measuring it? What can we do to help the organizations tell their story?</p> <p>Moving Schools of Hope from Tier 3 to Tier 2 was a major victory, but we didn’t have a way to articulate this to our Board. They already thought it was enough to be on the Portfolio. Maybe we need a clearer definition of Tier 2 or a division of Tier 2? Some donors distinguish between strong evaluations and weak or learning evaluations.</p> <p>We could also benefit from distinguishing between Tier 2’s that are on a clearinghouse and Tier 2’s that are not.</p> <p>This is an interesting evolution. In the beginning all an organization needed was an evaluation, not positive outcomes. We should be proponents of rigor, but keep in mind that we’re already</p>		<p>2 programs articulate their outcomes.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>losing some just by requiring logic models and literature reviews.</p> <p>Some research suggests that in mentoring programs it's enough if the child stays the same, if the program prevented their behavior from getting worse.</p> <p>We need to encourage self-reflection for program development.</p> <p>We should ask them to make their case, to tell their story and then include those stories on the website.</p> <p>We should host learning circles focused on evaluation.</p> <p>If people are reporting qualitative data they need to report statistical significance, but that is not the same thing as impact. Effect size is about impact. Asking them to talk about validity of measures is very important. We should raise the bar for Tire 2 renewals. Part of our job is to move the community to raise the bar. They may need to show multiple measures, qualitative and quantitative.</p> <p>Schools of Hope will probably never be Tier 1. Triple P does not advance organizational thinking and practice. Schools of Hope will continue to refine and evolve organizationally. They will change more than an organization implementing a Tier 1 program, but they will never be Tier 1. This is problematic.</p> <p>Could we add a local evaluation addendum for Tier 1 programs?</p> <p>We could split Tier 2 and make it Tier 2 with or without clearinghouse?</p> <p>We could split Tier 1 and make it Tier 1 with or without clearinghouse?</p> <p>If we have a community program that's really working well we should feel as good about that as a program that's been replicated nationwide. We should give them recognition.</p> <p>We should look cautiously about our criteria for Tier 1.</p> <p>We don't want to confuse people, but there should be a requirement for continuous improvement.</p> <p>As staff we try to dispel the feeling that Tier 1 is better than Tier 2.</p> <p>We also need a recommendation for changes/language around Tier 2 and how they talk about their outcomes.</p> <p><b>Summary: Staff will make recommendations for alternate Tier divisions and for language to help Tier 2 programs articulate their outcomes.</b></p>		
<b>Public Comment</b>	None at this time.	None	None
<b>Next Meeting/Final Comments</b>	The next meeting will be on June 18 at 520 Mendocino Ave unless there are no applications for review.	None	None
<b>Adjourn</b>	Adjourned at 2:30 pm.	None	None