



Wednesday, March 30, 2016 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

2:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

490 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Wisteria Conference Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

- Alison Lobb, Child Parent Institute
- B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting
- Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
- Ellen Bauer, Department of Health
- Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way
- Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
- Karin Demarest, Community Foundation
- Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
- Leah Benz, First 5
- Matthew Ingram, Driving Force Consultant

Monique Chapman, Sheriff’s Office

Rob Halverson, Probation Department

Staff (listed alphabetically)

Angie Dillon-Shore, Human Services Department

Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Hannah Euser, County Administrator’s Office

Serena Lienau, Violence Prevention Partnership

Public (listed alphabetically)

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes – Action Item	<p>Angie welcomed everyone</p> <p>Motion to approve the October minutes was made by BJ Bischoff and seconded by Karin Demarest.</p>	<p>Motion to approve the minutes: Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	None
Updates & Reports	<p>Angie provided an update on new programs approved for the Portfolio since the last meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tier 1 – Guiding Good Choices (<i>renewal</i>) and Motivational Interviewing (<i>renewal</i>) - The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship. • Tier 2 – Project Learn (moved from Tier 1 to Tier 2)- Boys & Girls Club of Central Sonoma County; and Tackling Tough Skills - Social Advocates for Youth, The Center for Social and Environmental Stewardship & West County Community Services. 	None	None
Introductions	<p>Committee membership updates:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Committee welcomes new members Matthew Ingram, Driving Force Consulting; 	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>Hannah Euser, County Administrator’s Office (not present); and Alison Lobb, Child Parent Institute.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Committee bids farewell to members whose terms have sunset: Monique Chapman, Sheriff’s Office; Jennifer O’Donnell, United Way; Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa (not present); and Ellen Bauer, Department of Health Services. We thank them for their service and valuable contributions! Thank you to Karin Demarest, Community Foundation, for her willingness to renew her membership for another 2-year term. 		
<p>NREPP Revised Review Process - ACTION ITEM</p>	<p>NREPP Revised Review Process.</p> <p>Joni provided an overview of the Legacy rating system and the revised rating scale.</p> <p>Reviewer qualifications:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Doctorate level degree Strong background in and understanding of current methods for evaluating prevention and treatment interventions Content area expertise Two part training pass/fail training Conflict of interest disclaimer <p>Joni:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All reviewers must be approved by SAMHSA. After approval, reviewers participate in a training and certification process. This two-part training begins with Web-based training modules and the completion of a knowledge assessment. Upon successful completion of the knowledge assessment, candidate reviewers are asked to complete and submit the NREPP Outcome Rating Instrument (NORI) assessing an evaluation study and participate in a conference call to discuss the assessment. NREPP staff review the NORI to determine whether a candidate receives a “pass” or “provisional pass.” If an individual receives a “provisional pass,” he or she is given a second study to assess. Certificates are sent to reviewers who have successfully completed both phases of the training. Reviewers are paid for their participation in the training upon certification. <p>Submission Requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mental or behavioral health outcomes and/or substance use outcomes 	<p>Motion to approve the recommendation:</p> <p>Yes: 12 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	<p>None</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of outcomes demonstrated in at least one experimental or quasi-experimental design. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single group, pre/post test or longitudinal/multiple time series will not be considered. • Published in a peer-reviewed journal or documented in a comprehensive evaluation report. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Include literature review, theoretical framework, purpose, methodology, findings/results with statistical analysis and p values for significant outcomes, discussion and conclusions. <p>Joni:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of these outcomes has been demonstrated in at least one study using an experimental or quasi-experimental design. Studies with single-group, pretest-posttest designs or single-group, longitudinal/multiple time series do not meet this requirement, but will be considered to identify emerging programs and practices for consideration in the Learning Center. • The results of these studies have been published in a peer-reviewed journal or other professional publication, or documented in a comprehensive evaluation report, published within the previous 25 years. • Applicants are required to provide full-text documents at the time of submission that demonstrate the intervention meets these minimum requirements. <p>Recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programs rated “Effective” for identified target outcomes meet Tier 1 criteria for Portfolio applications. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants identify target program outcomes to be represented in application. • Programs rated “Promising” for identified target outcomes meet Tier 2 criteria <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Applicants may apply as Tier 2 with clearinghouse by completing a fidelity table and identifying target outcomes. <p>Discussion: If a program has an evidence-based rating it could be Tier 1; if it has a promising rating it could be Tier 2 with clearinghouse. What if a program has mixed outcome ratings?</p>		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>What if a program has a red “X” meaning it is either ineffective or harmful? We could review the study summaries for programs with a red “X” to determine if they are harmful or just ineffective. We could still accept programs as Tier 1 or 2 if they were rated ineffective for some outcomes. We could not accept programs if they were harmful. What if harmful isn’t that significant? For example what if the program was helpful to reduce depression rates in new mothers, but they also gained a little weight? We could evaluate harmful effects on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Motion to accept programs for which all outcomes are rated “evidence-based” as Tier 1 and programs for which all outcomes are rated “promising” as Tier 2 with the option to apply with a fidelity chart. Programs with mixed outcome ratings will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Motion was made by B.J. and seconded by Rob.</p>		
Learning for Action Evaluation Update	Due to a lack of time this update will be added to the April 20 agenda	None	None
Public Comment	None	None	None
Next Meeting/Final Comments	The next meeting will be held on April 20, 2016.	None	None
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:00 pm.	None	None