



Wednesday, December 17, 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)

- B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting
- Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
- Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
- Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
- Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way
- Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
- Karin Demarest, Community Foundation
- Kate Pack, First 5
- 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
- Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

- Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
- Leo Tacata, District Attorney’s Office

Public (listed alphabetically)

- Andrew Leonard, United Way

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
<b>Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, Updates</b>	<p>Angie welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions.</p> <p>Motion to approve the minutes with the correction that Jennifer was not at the November meeting.</p> <p>Angie provided an update of recent technical assistance and programs added to the Portfolio. SAY’s submission of Motivational Interviewing will be discussed at the January 21<sup>st</sup> meeting.</p>	<p>Motion to approve the minutes: Carlos</p> <p>Second: B.J.</p> <p>Yes: 12</p> <p>No: 0</p> <p>Abstain: 0</p>	<p>None</p>
<b>Literature Review Summary</b>	<p><b>When organizations submit literature reviews that they have not written, would you like to require the submission of a summary that links the literature to the rest of the application? Please respond to the proposed cover sheet included in the agenda packet.</b></p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The problem statement should relate to the problem not the intervention. We need to know the literature addresses a specific problem. E.g. tutoring for math vs. tutoring for literacy.</li> <li>• Move references to the end.</li> </ul>	<p>None</p>	<p>Staff members will create a matrix and revised summary sheet.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove 1b, this requires too much data.</li> <li>It would be nice to have a grid that provides page numbers to reference dosage, audience, evaluation, etc.</li> </ul> <p><b>Staff members will revise accordingly and create a matrix.</b></p>		
<p><b>OJJDP Rating Scale</b></p>	<p>This and the following SAHMSA discussion should provide clarity around the larger issue we've encountered with changing clearinghouse criteria. For organizations previously rated as Tier 1 according to OJJDP standards that are no longer rated Tier 1 we would like to recommend grandfathering them at Tier 1 or allowing them to submit a fidelity matrix to renew as a Tier 2 program.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Programs are on Tier 1 because they're proven to be evidence based. These OJJDP programs are not equal to our Tier 1 programs.</li> <li>Promising OJJDP programs must have one study demonstrating positive effect.</li> <li>They don't deserve special treatment; they should have to submit a complete Tier 2 application.</li> <li>If it is on a clearinghouse, could we accept a fidelity matrix instead of submitting an entire Tier 2 application?</li> <li>Isn't the idea for Tier 1 that there's been enough evaluation done to show that if implemented with fidelity it will make a difference? Is that true for a promising practice?</li> <li>It's not about the program not working; it's about the type of studies that have been done. It's not as good as straight As, it's As and Bs. I think it's reasonable to call them a Tier 2 with a fidelity chart.</li> <li>We don't need to ask for a lit review, logic model, etc.?</li> <li>Tier 2 requires the program manual. If we go with a chart are we losing something? Would they need to submit the manual they're using to implement the program?</li> <li>If I'm an organization that's moving from Tier 1 to Tier 2. Submitting the manual doesn't require me to think about my programming. It's more important to go through the thinking process of the fidelity chart.</li> </ul>	<p>None</p>	<p>Staff will update the Clearinghouse crosswalk by Feb 2015.</p> <p>Review Committee will continue to consider allowing impacted organizations to apply with a Tier 2 fidelity chart.</p> <p>Staff will bring the previously used Tier 2 with clearinghouse application to a future discussion.</p> <p>Joni will invite all Review Committee members to the February Policy Committee meeting.</p> <p>Karin will update the Policy Committee on</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have defined categories for Tier 1, we would need to update our chart to specify what level was equal to a Tier 1 and what was equal to a Tier 2. Under what conditions can they use the matrix?</li> <li>• What’s the difference for promising on OJJDP and promising on CEBC?</li> <li>• As clearinghouses change we need to re-evaluate our clearinghouse crosswalk.</li> <li>• Staff will do the leg work to update clearinghouse chart and evaluate all clearinghouses. We’ll do the best we can to draw lines, but we may need a subcommittee to review our recommendations.</li> <li>• Why did we drop Tier 2 with clearinghouse? We didn’t know of any. We didn’t have an example.</li> <li>• We need two decisions. What to do with these 7 programs and what to do with our current clearinghouse standards.</li> <li>• Organizations that have been on hold, we will ask to submit a fidelity chart.</li> <li>• The problem we’re struggling with is that Tier 1s are attached to clearinghouses. By moving them from Tier 1 to Tier 2 we’re moving them down. Actually, they’re evidence-based, but promising. We have local Tier 2 programs that are Tier 1 quality. The clearinghouse component is what’s throwing us off.</li> <li>• Maybe we shouldn’t have 1 and 2. Maybe we have 1 and 2 together and then we have innovative practices that are local practices.</li> <li>• We would have to look at all of our Tier 2 programs and see where they fit.</li> <li>• There is a level of branding that has already occurred, this is a policy decision.</li> <li>• What do we do with all of the organizations that have already been included in the Portfolio? There are a lot of repercussions. Changing a lot of language could be damaging.</li> <li>• There’s no problem with using 1, 2, and 3. What we’re suggesting is a change in how you get on those tiers and move through them. I’m suggesting that we disentangle whether they’re on a clearinghouse with Tier 1 status. There should be multiple ways to</li> </ul>		<p>changes to Review Committee policy and process at a meeting TBD.</p> <p>Staff members will update pending organizations.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>get on each tier level.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Have these 7 programs done anything to reapply to the OJJDP with new studies? The onus to find out what the national organization is doing in response to the new rating is on the local chapter.</li> <li>• These orgs should be able to apply for Tier 2 with clearinghouse.</li> <li>• The policy committee should be aware of these changes, but they don't have the expertise to make these changes. It's about informing the Policy Committee, not asking for a decision. The Review Committee doesn't report to the Policy Committee. We need to educate them on our level of rigor.</li> <li>• One of the reasons we didn't do Tier 1 without clearinghouse was that our committee members are not schooled in evaluation.</li> <li>• Let's table the conversation about what it takes to be on Tier 1 without a clearinghouse until January.</li> <li>• We can all agree that grandfathering is not an option.</li> <li>• Staff will update the Clearinghouse Crosswalk by February. Let pending applicants maintain Tier 1 status until the committee has reached a final decision. Staff will bring the previously used Tier 2 with Clearinghouse application to future discussions.</li> </ul> <p><b>Review Committee will continue to discuss the possibility of allowing organizations impacted by the revised OJJDP criteria to apply as Tier 2 programs with a fidelity matrix.</b></p>		
<p><b>SAHMSA Appropriateness Analysis</b></p>	<p>We currently require all programs to have a 4 for data analysis. Only 2 of the 10 Tier 1 programs included in SAHMSA meet this requirement. Joni described the SAHMSA review process. SAHMSA considers a 2 to be the same for all of the last three criteria and considers a 4 to be truly exceptional.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Why did we elevate analysis?</li> <li>• It's elevated because it demonstrates a relationship between interventions and outcomes.</li> <li>• The language describing what a 2 means doesn't suggest anything positive for this</li> </ul>	<p>Motion to accept an overall score of 2.5 or higher for all outcomes. Motion: Rebecca Second: Karin Yes: 11 No: 1 Abstain: 0</p>	<p>Staff members will revise crosswalk.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>category. It says the analysis may not have been appropriate or the sample size was inadequate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We have been operating off of a misinterpretation of their definitions.</li> <li>• Would a rating of 2 be equal to our Tier 2?</li> <li>• Now that we know how programs are rated I think we could look at overall ratings.</li> </ul> <p><b>Rebecca motioned to accept an overall rating of 2.5 or higher as long as there are no 0s in any category.</b></p> <p><b>Motion approved.</b></p>		
<p><b>Tier 2 Renewal Process</b></p>	<p><b>B.J. summarized the steps taken to arrive at the current renewal process.</b></p> <p>We approved a renewal policy in September 2013. After additional feedback we thought it would be better to have a renewal form, instead of requiring an updated submission. This form and decision were approved in October 2013. We’ve also had conversations about a local evaluation but realize our community is not ready for that yet. Based on our second decision in October it was staff members understanding that the original application would only be re-reviewed if there had been program changes.</p> <p><b>Discussion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Our expertise and standards have changed. Applicants need to align with our current standards.</li> <li>• Do they need to submit a new application?</li> <li>• What is the expectation for us?</li> <li>• We don’t have inter-relator reliability.</li> <li>• How do we support this work? We need to have the capacity to support the work we’re asking them to do.</li> <li>• We need to require the increased rigor. We need to provide the time and TA, to support this. We need to provide messaging around this.</li> <li>• We want to help you elevate your programming. We want to help you improve your program. The process is reflective.</li> <li>• We could give them an extension, but they need to submit an application that is up to standard.</li> </ul> <p>All organizations will need to amend original applications to meet current requirements.</p>		<p>Upstream staff members will notify renewing organizations and provide technical assistance as necessary.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	Upstream staff members will provide technical assistance around this before renewals are sent to reviewers. Organizations may receive an extension if they are actively working on their renewal.		
<b>Public Comment</b>	None	None	None
<b>Next Meeting/Final Comments</b>	The next meeting will be on January 21 at 490 Mendocino Ave.	None	None
<b>Adjourn</b>	Adjourned at 3:00 pm.	None	None