



Wednesday, September 21, 2016 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.

520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

Alison Lobb, Child Parent Institute  
 B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Consulting  
 Dan Schurman, St. Joseph Health  
 Emmanuel Moon, United Way of the Wine Country  
 Hannah Euser, County Administrator’s Office  
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department  
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department  
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department  
 Susan Stark, Sheriff’s Office  
 Teddie Pierce, Decipher HMIS

Staff (listed alphabetically)

Helen Simi, Human Services Department  
 Joni Thacher, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University  
 Karin Demarest, Community Foundation  
 Kristen Fladseth, Department of Health Services  
 Leah Benz, First 5  
 Matthew Ingram, Driving Force Consultant

Public (listed alphabetically)

Pat Kuta, North Bay Organizing Project  
 Susan Shaw, North Bay Organizing Project

| Topic  | Discussion   | Decision  | Next Steps |
|--|--|---|------------|
| <b>Welcome, Introductions, Minutes – Action Item</b> | Joni welcomed everyone and facilitated introductions. Joni announced that Angie has taken a position as First 5 Director.<br><br>Motion to approve the April minutes was made by Julie and seconded by Katie.  | Motion to approve the minutes:<br>Yes: 4<br>No: 0<br>Abstain: 6 | None       |
| <b>Updates &amp; Reports</b>                         | <b>We are at 101 programs on the Portfolio!</b><br>Since we met in April, 13 programs have been approved to the Portfolio, including 5 renewals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Tier 1- Motivational Interviewing &amp; Seeking Safety</u>, COTS; <b>Safe Dates</b>, Alliance Medical Center; <b>Teen Triple P (Primary 3)</b>; Sunny Hills Services</li> <li>• <u>Tier 2 – Mothers and Babies Course</u>, Child-Parent Institute; <b>Operation Access Sonoma County</b>, Operation Access; <b>Child &amp; Adult Care Food Program</b>, 4Cs</li> <li>• <u>Change from Tier 3 to Tier 2 - TALK (Teachers Acquiring Language Learner Knowledge) renewal</u>, Sonoma County Office of Education</li> <li>• <u>Tier 3 – Professional Development: Arts Integration Tools for Teachers</u>, Luther Burbank Center for the Arts; <b>Summer Reading &amp; Writing Academy</b>, Sonoma Valley Education Foundation obo</li> </ul> | None  | None       |

| Topic  | Discussion  | Decision  | Next Steps  |
|--|---|---|---|
|  | <p>Sonoma Valley Unified School District; <b>WHEEL Plus renewal</b>, Santa Rosa Chamber of Commerce; <b>Grade Level Proficiency Project</b>, Sonoma Valley Education Foundation; <b>Imagine You</b>, Integrative Medical Clinic Foundation.</p> <p><b>Update on Board Report and Presentation on August 30.</b><br/> The Board approved the following recommendations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Receive <i>LFA Upstream Investments Policy Systems Change Evaluation</i>.</li> <li>• Approve 1 FTE Program Planning &amp; Evaluation Analyst to support technical assistance.</li> </ul>  |   |   |
| <p><b>New Members Oath of Office</b></p>   | <p><i>Welcome new Review Committee members:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Kristen Fladseth, Department of Health Services</li> <li>• Susan Stark, Sheriff's Office</li> <li>• Daniel Schurman, St. Joseph Health</li> <li>• Teddie Pierce, Decipher HMIS</li> <li>• Emmanuel Moon, United Way of the Wine Country</li> </ul> <p><i>Oaths of Office completed by members either new to the Committee or do not have a current oath on file:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Daniel Schurman</li> <li>• Teddie Pierce</li> <li>• Emmanuel Moon</li> <li>• B.J. Bischoff</li> </ul> <p><i>County employees have already submitted an oath and do not need to reaffirm.</i></p>                         | None  | None  |
| <p><b>Application to the Portfolio: North Bay Organizing Project, North Bay Organizing Project – Action Item</b></p> | <p><b>North Bay Organizing Project, North Bay Organizing Project</b><br/> <b>Reviewers: All present</b><br/> Recusals : None</p> <p>The committee discussed the North Bay Organizing Project application submitted by North Bay Organizing Project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Items in question: Literature Review and Logic Model</li> <li>• Reviewers: B.J. Bischoff (approved )and Hannah Euser (recommended TA).</li> </ul> <p>B.J. approved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It was a tough application and she can see why Hannah denied, however, it was tough because there was not a lot of research done in this area. She found a literature review that she recommends NBOP use.</li> </ul> | Motion to recommend North Bay Organizing Project for Technical Assistance:<br>Yes: 8<br>No: 2<br>Abstain: 0 | Upstream staff will provide TA to North Bay Organizing Project, |

| Topic | Discussion  | Decision | Next Steps |
|-------|---|----------|------------|
|       | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The outcomes from her newly discovered lit review do match the logic model. All in all, work will not change regardless of what literature review is used.</li> <li>• The reviewer should know that it doesn't matter if the sources within a lit review are over 15 years old. We only care if the lit review itself is over 15 years.</li> <li>• The reason I accepted it is because when you look at the short term outcomes in the logic model, the lit review does back it up.</li> </ul> <p>Hannah recommended TA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hannah believes NBOP is running a wonderful organization. She can see why B.J. approved.</li> <li>• She was most concerned with the age of the literature review that was used. There is also more current literature review that exists which she feels could have and perhaps should have been used.</li> <li>• Hannah did not initially make a relevant correlation between logic model and literature.</li> <li>• Logical model focused more on organization versus the outcomes in the logic model.</li> <li>• The evaluation plan was very clear.</li> <li>• <b>Logic Model:</b> If the problem statement is solved, then relationships and power will be built. However, this isn't directly relevant to the outcomes identified. There is not a clear connection to the literature review.</li> </ul> <p>Response from NBPO:<br/>They thanked us for the opportunity to apply to the Upstream Portfolio. They have reviewed B.J.'s recommended literature review and ask that they have the opportunity to integrate that into their literature review.</p> <p>Susan and Pat read off a statement that they will formally submit to the Committee to be put on the record. (See attachments). One example of a successful outcome is how members start off by being involved in transportation organization which leads up to State legislation at the Capital. Their program leads to a step-by-step up opportunity to increase their involvement in community development, organization and leadership.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <p>B.J.: She sees that the goal here is more focused on leadership development and a learning culture versus immediate tangible and measurable outcomes.</p> <p>Rob: It is a struggle to accept a literature review that simply states "research has shown" without more substantial analysis on the research outcomes.</p> |          |            |

| Topic   | Discussion   | Decision | Next Steps |
|---|--|----------|------------|
|   | <p>Dan: To clarify the literature review should inform the application and logic model.</p> <p>Katie: It is difficult to discuss whether we should accept a practice or strategy versus program outcomes. Seeing that there is a new literature review, the 2<sup>nd</sup> reviewer should be able to review it to see if it is acceptable, if we feel the original lit reviewers were not acceptable.</p> <p>Hannah confirms that her only concern with the logic model is the disconnect to the lit review.</p> <p>Emmanuel: Although he enjoyed reading the lit review, he did find the research methodology was missing.</p> <p>Alison: I did see a connection between the lit review and the logic model and found that the logic model is plausible in and of itself.</p> <p>Katie motions to refer the organization for TA. Rob seconds the motion.</p> <p>Discussion ensued to help new members understand the review process that just occurred and general questions on the application review process overall.</p>  |          |            |
| <b>Learning for Action Evaluation Results</b> | <p><b><i>Joni reviewed the final LFA Evaluation Report in the context of Systems Change.</i></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Upstream has done well at putting in place the five core conditions of collective impact.</li> <li>• The Upstream backbone team is a respected, talented, and dedicated group of people supporting Upstream’s implementation, and the technical assistance to nonprofits provided by backbone team staff is highly regarded and promotes initiative buy-in.</li> <li>• Upstream has articulated and promoted a common agenda that largely inspires buy-in and commitment.</li> <li>• The Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs has become the central focus of mutually reinforcing activities, and it provides a concrete structure and process for active alignment with the common agenda.</li> <li>• The Upstream committees functioned well for planning, launching, and developing Upstream. While the Policy Committee and Executive Committee meetings are excellent forums for information-sharing, they have room to grow in terms of truly using data for learning and strategic decision-making.</li> <li>• Upstream has established the 26 Indicators of Success as the centerpiece of shared measurement. At the same time, many challenges stand in the way of tracking aggregated program outcomes –</li> </ul> | None     | None       |

| Topic | Discussion   | Decision | Next Steps |
|-------|--|----------|------------|
|       | <p>including cost, data linking, nonprofit burden, and data privacy issues.</p> <p>Joni reviewed the process and data collected from the evaluation process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data was collective from multiple sources including documents, 28 interviews conducted from different partners, provider survey and investment data from funders.</li> <li>• LFA conducted the evaluation, however during 2 full day workshops the Evaluation Work Group helped prioritize themes and recommendations.</li> <li>• Highlights from the provider survey results were reported. 53% of providers on the Portfolio responded and 33% of providers not on the Portfolio.</li> <li>• The evidence collected from Upstream committee members, the Board of Supervisors, County Departments, private funders, and providers paints a clear picture showing that Upstream’s envisioned systems change is indeed underway.</li> <li>• A Universal Frame of Reference was Developed which consists of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Upstream provides support for organizational behavior</li> <li>○ Aligned Organization Behaviors</li> <li>○ Resource Flows</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Julie had questions as to why we are looking at how programs have affected the Health Action goals. Joni explained that part of the recommendations that came out of the LFA evaluation is to align more deeply with HA and use the HDI to measure impact vs the 26 indicators.</p> <p>Rob appreciates the value of the HA 3 goal areas, however, working in Probation, he feels they are left out of the equation as they can be seen more as a downstream service provider. He feels there is a big hole where criminal justice indicators are missing.</p> <p>Teddie wants to see more focus on housing.</p> <p>B.J. questions whether we can provide organizations with a discount for using SPSS to help them tackle their evaluation plans through a bulk purchase.</p> <p>Alison reiterates that in the non-profit world, no one receives funding for evaluations.</p> <p>B.J. says Sonoma County Community Foundation is now funding evaluations.</p> <p>Recommendation Priority Areas for Upstream’s 2017 -2020 Work plan:</p> |          |            |

| Topic                                   | Discussion  | Decision | Next Steps |
|---|---|----------|------------|
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Aligned Initiatives:</b> 1) Continue to deepen and expand collaboration with Health Action; 2) Adopt and monitor the Human Development Index (HDI) as long term indicators of progress.</li> <li>• <b>TA and the Portfolio:</b> 3) Reassess the roles and responsibilities of the Portfolio Review Committee; 4) Expand TA for service providing organizations and County Departments to increase the community’s ability and capacity to implement prevention focused evidence-informed programming. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Joni provided narrative from the report where there were suggestions for improvement, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Being more aware of being rigorous for the sake of being rigorous vs for overall quality improvement of the programs and their outcomes.</li> <li>▪ Bringing in outside consultants where more content expertise is necessary. This seems to be outside the scope of the PRC.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>Community Engagement:</b> 5) Continue to expand the Upstream Investments outreach campaign.</li> <li>• <b>Shared Measurement:</b> 6) Expand resources and continue to build community capacity for shared measurement to measure aggregate program data that reflects how clients are directly impacted.</li> <li>• <b>Stewardship:</b> 7) Promote active stewardship by revisiting Policy Committee mission, governance structure and purpose.</li> </ul> |          |            |
| <b>Public Comment</b>                   | None.   | None     | None       |
| <b>Next Meeting/<br/>Final Comments</b> | The next meeting will be held on October 19, 2016.  | None     | None       |
| <b>Adjourn</b>                          | Adjourned at 3:00 pm.   | None     | None       |