Wednesday, November 19, 2014 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes
1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Conference Room

Members (listed alphabetically)
BJ Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting
Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way
Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
Kate Pack, First 5
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

Staff (listed alphabetically)
Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services Department
Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)
Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
Rebecca Wachsberg, Probation Department
Stephen Jackson, SCOE

Public (listed alphabetically)
Cathryn Couch, Ceres Community Project
Debra Solomon, Human Services Agency of San Francisco
Kristin James-Bowe, Napa County Health and Human Services

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, Updates	Angie welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions. Motion to approve the minutes. Angie provided an update of recent technical assistance and programs added to the Portfolio.	Motion to approve the minutes: BJ Second: Carol Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0	None
Application to the Portfolio	**Ceres Community Project Healthy Meals for Heathy Communities** **Items for discussion: Logic Model and Evaluation** **Youth component is not addressed but is a critical element of the program** B.J. and Carlos recused themselves Monique approved the program, Serena denied the program. Angie explained that Ceres submitted an application specifically for their Teen Mentoring program earlier this year. A copy of the program was provided for the committee's reference.	Motion to approve Healthy Meals for Healthy Communities to the Portfolio and add a footnote to reference Ceres Teen Mentoring application.	Staff members will add a footnote. Healthy Meals will be included in the Upstream Portfolio.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	Monique: I had no concerns and had also reviewed Cere's Teen Mentoring program that was submitted earlier this year. This program differs in that it provides services to both adults and youth. This was an excellent and very robust application. My only concern was that there was a lot of information, and I didn't want to miss anything. I felt it met our standards. **Serena:** I felt the application was very well put together. My concern was that there was very little mention of the youth piece. I felt that this was a critical component that needed to be developed. I didn't review the other application and it didn't feel like a complete package. I would like a better understanding of why the programs were separated. This was a fantastic application, but I would like to see the youth piece developed. **Monique:** I was initially confused. I thought it was the same application I'd reviewed earlier this year. I removed the youth piece from my thinking when I reviewed this application. The youth application was specific to mentoring, this application is specific to providing meals. **Serena:** I think it's great that the applications are separate, but I need to see linkage between the two. As simple as making a reference in the logic model, or a note to reference the other application. **Committee Discussion:** • Are they so separate they can stand on their own without a reference to each other? Could the programs exist on their own? • Maybe there just needs to be a footnote that references the other application? **Angie:** Is there any more discussion before I invite public comment? **Cathryn:** The client side is more important to the youth development than the inverse. It's a complicated program to put into one application. Because we run them both separately we chose to pull them apart for the applications, but the truth is they are totally integrated. We had an assumption the committee would be aware of our previous application. **Committee Discussion:** • They really are one program. Maybe we could approve them as a part 1 and 2? • They have different strategies, outcomes, and evaluations though. We have other programs, like Triple P, that are part of a larger program. • If either of these can be standalone programs they should be separate applications. • The logic models are very different. I found enough evidence to demonstrate that these	Motion: Rob Second: Monique Yes : 10 No: 0 Abstain: 2	

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	are separate programs. • Maybe as these programs move from Tier 2 to Tier 3 the application could integrate both programs. **Rob:** Move to approve Healthy Meals for Healthy Communities if a footnote is added to reference the Teen Mentoring application for more details on the youth component. Staff members can do this, it does not need to be returned to the applicant. **Monique:** I second the motion. **Healthy Meals for Healthy Communities will be included as a Tier 3 program in the Portfolio for 3 years. Staff will add a footnote to link the Teen Mentoring program.**		
Additional days for a review	Rebecca submitted a request agenda item form asking the committee to consider increasing the time for reviews from 5 days to 10 days. **Discussion**: • Originally we only had 3 days to return a review. What was the justification for the short turn around? • Many applicants use this for funding. The faster the better. Five days was a compromise. • Funding is still a consideration, but most organizations have months to complete funding requirements. They need to plan ahead. • If you give me more days, I'll take more days and still be late. • Reminders help. It would be nice to get a half-way reminder. • Rebecca wasn't able to attend this meeting. She expressed that allowing for a 10 day review would ensure she had a weekend to complete the review. If there isn't a significant reason to complete the review in five days, it's not worth it to reconfigure her schedule to try and get it done. • Could we allow for requests for expedited reviews? • No, organizations need to plan ahead. Even if an application is submitted months in advance of a deadline, the process can still be lengthy if it goes to committee or needs TA. **Review Committee members will now have 10 days to complete reviews.**	Motion to increase review time to 10 days. Motion: Carol Second: Karin Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0	Staff members will update the bylaws.
SAHMSA Required score & Appropriateness Analysis	Our instructions require programs to be ranked 2 or 4 for all SAHMSA criteria, but scores fall between 2 and 4, e.g. 3.9, 2.5. This is confusing for applicants. Can we revise this to include anything 2 or above? **Language will be revised to read "2 or higher."** We currently require all programs to have a 4 for data analysis. Very few programs are ranked this high. Could we consider accepting lower scores?	Motion to accept 2 or higher for all criteria except Appropriateness of Analysis. Motion: Katie	Staff members will research SAHMSA review standards.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	Discussion: - Why did we elevate analysis? - It's elevated because it demonstrates a relationship between interventions and outcomes. - The language describing what a 2 means doesn't suggest anything positive for this category. It says the analysis may not have been appropriate or it was inadequate. In the other categories a 2 suggests something positive. - It would be good to know what a score between 2 and 4 means. - The spirit of the committee is to have a yes/no switch for clearinghouses. To construct a similar understanding the committee said everything is good on SAHMSA except for the evidence-based piece which must be a 4. Researchers are going to say this is a 0 or 4. We wanted something that was very solid and clear. I struggle with not having a 4 but understand that this could sink a lot of applications. **B.J. motioned to accept a 2 or higher.** **Discussion:** - That means that their sample size could be inadequate. Are we OK with that? - Couldn't we infer that if it's a 3 most reviewers thought it was a 4? - I'm concerned we do not want certain programs to be affected. We need to maintain rigor. - We need more time and information. We need to know how many reviewers, do reviewers assign a range of scores, what's the definition of a score between 2 and 4. **Discussion tabled. Staff members will provide additional information in December.**	Second: Serena Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0	
OJJDP changed rating scale	We require programs to be rated exemplary or effective. There is no longer and exemplary rating. The new scale includes effective, promising, and no effect. This will affect 4 tier 1 programs that are renewing and are currently rated promising on the OJJDP site. **Discussion:** - All programs have been rerated with the Crime Solutions rating scale. - The OJJDP definition of promising is "in general this study demonstrates promising (perhaps inconsistent) evidence in favor of the program when evaluated with a design of high quality (quasi-experimental). More extensive research is required." - This does not meet our standard for Tier 1. - All we can accept from OJJDP is effective. **Carol motioned to only accept programs rated effective by the OJJDP for Tier 1 inclusion.** **Discussion:** - There is a larger question. What do we do with programs that were Tier 1 and will no	Motion to only accept programs rated effective by the OJJDP for Tier 1 Portfolio inclusion. Motion: Carol Second: Julie Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0	Staff will contact renewing organizations that will be affected.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	longer be Tier 1? • Funders don't give more points for a higher Tier. It's not a big deal. • This means that 4 organizations that have been Tier 1 programs will now have to complete a Tier 2 application to stay on the Portfolio. Three of these organizations have already completed and submitted their Tier 1 renewal applications. • This is why the Tier 1 renewal process is so important. Our website and instructions need to reflect that just because a program was on a clearinghouse doesn't mean it will always be on a clearinghouse. • Rating is always subject to change. This is a changing and growing field. It's a data driven culture. Affected organizations will need to complete a Tier 2 application.		
Accreditation	In May 2013 the Portfolio Review Committee decided not to accept accreditation for Tier 1 programs. All programs would need to complete a fidelity chart. However, the committee elected to leave a note on Tier 1 applications instructing organizations participating in an accreditation process to contact staff members before completing the fidelity chart. What should staff members response be when this happens? **Discussion:** • They could submit everything they're required to submit for accreditation and we could evaluate that. • What about a time limit? How recent does their accreditation have to be? • Everyone should have to complete the fidelity table. **Decision to remove all references to accreditation and require all organizations to complete the fidelity table.**	Remove all references to accreditation.	Staff members will update application documents.
Tier 2 Renewals	If there have been no changes to a program can staff approve Tier 2 renewals? • I thought we were going to see the original packet? • You don't need us if we're not re-evaluating a program. • If we re-review the original program we're second guessing our original decision. • We need to do that. We need to re-evaluate every Tier 2 program. • We need to look at when our process changed. They should be held to current standards. • We need a current list of all the changes we've made to our process over the years. • It's possible that even if the criteria have remained the same, there's a possibility that the new reviewers will have different opinions. **Conversation tabled. We will discuss Tier 2 renewal procedures in December.**	None	Staff members will review historical changes.

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Literature Review Cover Sheet	Would it be helpful to have a standard literature review cover sheet that required organizations to articulate how the literature related to their programming? Some organizations submit multiple lengthy literature reviews. **Staff members will create a template and bring it to the December meeting.**	None	Staff members will create a cover sheet template.
Public Comment	None at this time.	None	None
Next Meeting/Final Comments	The next meeting will be on December 17 at 520 Mendocino Ave even if there are no applications for review.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:00 pm.	None	None