



Wednesday, July 16, 2014 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.

490 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, SCTA Conference Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

- BJ Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting
- Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
- Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
- Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
- Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way
- 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
- Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa

Stephen Jackson, SCOE

Staff (listed alphabetically)

- Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services Department
- BJ Bischoff, Project Staff
- Cynthia King, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

- Joni Thacher, Human Services Department
- Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department

Public (listed alphabetically)

- Alfredo Perez, First 5
- Doria Trombetta
- Leah Benz, First 5
- Megan Sirna, Human Services Department

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, Updates	<p>Angie welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions.</p> <p>Motion to approve the minutes.</p> <p>Cynthia provided an update of recent technical assistance and programs added to the Portfolio.</p> <p>In the future, when a renewal is submitted that indicates changes have been made to the program, the original application will be sent to the reviewers along with the changed elements.</p>	<p>Motion to approve the minutes: Jennifer</p> <p>Second: Carlos</p> <p>Yes:</p> <p>No: 0</p> <p>Abstain: 2</p>	None
Application to the Portfolio	<p>Sonoma County Human Services Department – READY (BJ facilitated)</p> <p>Items for discussion: Literature Review</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Summary of what is not known is missing <p>Ellen, Julie, Kate, and Carol recused themselves</p> <p>BJ provided an overview of the program. Rebecca approved the program, Stephen recommended technical assistance.</p>	<p>Motion to approve READY for Tier 3 Portfolio inclusion.</p> <p>Motion: Jennifer</p> <p>Second: Carlos</p> <p>Yes : 9</p>	READY will be included in the Upstream Portfolio.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Rebecca: I approved the application because the score form says “a summary of what is known OR not known”. READY adequately showed what was known.</p> <p>Stephen: It is important when looking at literature, especially with education and early childhood, that we know what is not working. It’s important enough for me that if we are moving towards evidence-based practices that we include what is not known. This is a new program that is just beginning; it’s hard to figure out. There will be potential hazards and road blocks. I want to see what is unknown about the topic. Improving students’ abilities at early grade levels is a moving target. I also want to say that this is an exciting program and I commend those who put it together because it is extremely comprehensive.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Addressing challenges in the K – 12 curriculum is not easy. I think there is work that needs to be done with the challenges from other evidence-based programs. • I would have passed it, but agree that the application could be strengthened by addressing challenges. • This might be a technicality, but if the instructions say OR, then that is what has been asked. I have concerns about setting the bar so high and so strict that people don’t apply. This is an issue that can be dealt with when they apply to Tier 2. • At first I didn’t understand what was meant by “not known.” It seems to be referring to challenges that might exist. Questions or challenges of what they are proposing would be useful, and perhaps we should ask for that in the future. • The policies and procedures were highly developed and explicit. They did not discuss what not to do, but their explanation of what to do was so complete that I could infer what not to do. • It goes back to missteps and being careful. The application spent a lot of time on overall programming and implementation and not individual site implementation. Because this is a difficult place to be it is I important to be clear about what to avoid and watch out for. • It’s a new program. They haven’t gone to schools yet. They can’t know what not to do. • Programs that have been operating for a long time and programs that are being implemented for the first time have the same Tier 3 criteria. The criteria can seem subjective, but I like that we have the leeway to approve a program even if a small piece is missing. We need to tease out the process; maybe you need to have your program implemented for a period of time before moving to the next tier. • This process can be frustrating for the applicant as well as the reviewer. Our partners 	<p>No: 0 Abstain: 4</p>	

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>want to have the best program possible so the more detail we can provide, the better.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Funders and policy makers are looking at us to inform their decisions. We have developed this process which can make it muddy, we have to be sensitive to where programs are, but we have to be separate. We need to encourage emerging programs in the county, but that is not the job of this committee. We need to use the criteria we've established. <p>Public Comment: Megan: Thank you. It has been interesting to be on the other side. It says OR, so I assumed that is what it meant. I like Carlos's point that it is about the challenges. On the Policies and Procedures, the biggest reason is that it is a pilot project and we don't know yet. It felt too limiting because we don't know yet. Thank you. Leah: She said what I was going to say. Megan is a fabulous writer and we are behind everything in this document. If it said "potential challenges" it would have been easier to complete. This conversation has been helpful and clear.</p> <p>Monique: Move to approve READY for Tier 3. Rob: I second the motion.</p> <p>Motion passed unanimously.</p> <p>Summary: READY was approved for Tier 3 Portfolio inclusion.</p>		
<p>Process</p>	<p>Angie resumed her role as facilitator.</p> <p>Ellen: Maybe we can have a process evaluation on how people experience our process. READY could have used one for their implementation.</p> <p>The HSD READY team recognizes that we need a process evaluation and are developing one. We also need to discuss something – we shouldn't be afraid to deny programs. We always have to worry about that. These kinds of discussions from the disagreements help us move forward. The next question is who reviews an application. On an NSF panel, people with experience in the field would have reviewed it.</p> <p>I see our varied backgrounds as a strength. It's a tool that brings up good questions and I value everyone's knowledge.</p> <p>It can be hard to say to another colleague "I know more about this," but that needs to be OK. That allows us to be enlightened. It should be OK to share expertise.</p> <p>We need to remember our objective. People should stick to their guns, Tier 3 should be rigorous.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>Staff will make recommendations for alternate Tier divisions and for language to help Tier 2 programs articulate their outcomes.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Is there a way for us to discuss concerns, even if it is passed or not passed?</p> <p>There is an agenda item request form.</p> <p>There used to be an oral report on programs that had passed.</p> <p>That took too long. Written is fine.</p>		
Public Comment	None at this time.	None	None
Next Meeting/Final Comments	The next meeting will be on August 20 at 520 Mendocino Ave unless there are no applications for review.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 2:30 pm.	None	None