



UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

It is easier to build strong children than to fix broken lives.

Portfolio Review Committee Table of Contents

Please use page numbers in **red** in the **upper right corner** of the PDF

1. Agenda	2
2. Minutes	3
3. Update Report	12
4. Updated Fidelity Chart	14
5. Updated Logic Model	15
6. DRAFT Program Renewal Policy	17
7. Program Description Renewal Form	20
8. Tier 1 Renewal Form	24
9. Tier 2 Renewal Form	28
10. Tier 3 Renewal Form	30
11. Tier 2 and 3 Evaluation Plan Instructions	32



Portfolio Review Committee Agenda

October 16, 2013 1:00 p.m. to 3:30 p.m.
520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

All supporting documents are available at www.SonomaUpstream.org and at the Board of Supervisors office at 575 Administration Drive, Room 100A, Santa Rosa, CA, during normal business hours. For accessibility assistance with this agenda or supporting documents, please e-mail Info@SonomaUpstream.org or call 707.565.5800.

- 1:00 Welcome, Introductions, Agenda ACTION ITEM**
Approve Minutes from September meeting
- 1:10 Updates & Reports**
Update on portfolio activity since last meeting
Tier 1 Fidelity Chart updated
Logic Model updated
- 1:25 Removal of Review Committee Member ACTION ITEM**
Susan Castillo
- 1:30 Draft Renewal Documents ACTION ITEM**
Review revised program renewal policy and renewal application forms
- 1:50 Discussion Item**
Suggest common language for feedback to organizations regarding the renewal process
- 2:00 Discussion Item**
Ensuring Tier 3 evaluation plans match Tier 2 evaluation requirements
- 2:30 Discussion Item**
Tier 2 evaluation requirements
- 3:15 Public comment**
- 3:30 Adjourn**

Upcoming Meetings

November 20th, 2013, 520 Mendocino Ave
December 18th, 2013, 520 Mendocino Ave



Wednesday, September 20, 2013 Portfolio Review Committee Meeting Minutes

1:00 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

520 Mendocino Ave, Santa Rosa, Laurel Room

Members (listed alphabetically)

Alfredo Perez, First 5 Sonoma County
 Carlos Ayala, Sonoma State University
 Carol Simmons, Child Care Planning Council
 Dan Blake, SCOE
 Jennifer O'Donnell, United Way
 Julie Sabbag-Maskey, Human Services Department
 Katie Greaves, Human Services Department
 Monique Chapman, Sheriff's Office
 Rob Halverson, Probation Department
 Stephen Jackson, SCOE

Staff (listed alphabetically)

B.J. Bischoff, Bischoff Performance Improvement Consulting
 Joni Thacher, Human Services Department
 Oscar Chavez, Human Services Department

Not Present (listed alphabetically)

Leo Tacata, District Attorney's Office
 Robert Judd, Community Foundation
 Serena Lienau, City of Santa Rosa
 Susan Castillo, Department of Health Services

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
Welcome, Introductions, Minutes, Updates	<p>Introductions. B.J. welcomed everyone. The committee reviewed the minutes from the last meeting.</p> <p>Robert motioned to pass the minutes.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to revise the minutes. Several of the inputs are actually outputs. <p>One program has been added to the Portfolio. MAYi was approved as a Tier 3 program.</p> <p>We also have two outstanding applications.</p> <p>Could we add a section to the Update report to reflect programs approved in the last month?</p>	<p>Motion: Robert</p> <p>Second: Carlos</p> <p>Yes: 10</p> <p>No: 0</p> <p>Abstain: 0</p>	<p>Staff will revise the minutes.</p> <p>Staff will add a new programs section to the report.</p>
Renewal Process	<p>Staff updated the committee on the renewal process. All programs expiring before August 31, 2014 have been given a six month grace period. They have been called and sent a follow-up email with application documents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dan noted that he had heard that one or two organizations were surprised and had concerns about the renewal process. It may not have come through clearly that they could cut and paste from their previous application. Another organization was concerned because they had hired a temp to help with their 		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>first application. They probably won't be able to do this again.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Early applicants won't be able to cut and paste. We have changed our forms significantly. The process may get easier as we go and our process is more firmly established. • We've really stepped up our rigor over the years. • As a committee we need to balance the effort that these organizations are putting into these applications with the benefit they are getting out of it. • What do we want to do about this? Do we want to change our policy? Do we want to grandfather people in? • How do the clearinghouses do it? • The research we've done to date reflects that most clearinghouses monitor current research and review programs when relevant research requires. We don't have the staff to monitor the research. • Is three years the magic number for renewal? For Tier 3's it is. They have always known they would need to renew in three years. What about T2 and T3? • That will lead to a discussion we are going to have later today. Do Tier 2 programs need a local evaluation to remain on the Portfolio? • T1 is really about fidelity and is a program still on the clearinghouse. If an organization's budget is cut can they still maintain fidelity? • Won't we still have the same question if we give them 4 or 5 years? They may still decide it's not worth their time. • The issue isn't the amount of time, the issue is if there should be a renewal process at all. If we stretched it to 4 years it would give them extra time. • As a Tier 3 having the deadline has pushed us to do things a little differently. Knowing our goal has pushed us to do things sooner. <p>Tier 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do we establish a different renewal system for Tier 1 programs? Maybe we just ask them if anything has changed? • If you're a Tier 1 someone is already monitoring you through the clearinghouse. • Maybe we have a different plan for Tier 1 and 2 than for Tier 3. • Clarification – the clearinghouses do not monitor local fidelity. From our Tier 1 programs we need to know if they have made adaptations and if they are still on the clearinghouse. • There could be an easier way for Tier 1. Maybe we could waive the prerequisites and program description. Their renewal process could be simpler. 		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What if we up the value to programs to stay on the Portfolio? We haven't done a lot in terms of public recognition. • Cradle to Career is creating a web site that is searchable. • The issue around Tier 2 and Tier 3 is a different issue. Tier 3 is just a plan. Tier 3's are beginning their evaluation. They are committed to continual quality improvement. Increasing the time period may be a disadvantage. At three years they may need to rework their evaluation. Katie has a Tier 3 that may fall off. • Do we want to keep it the way it is? • Let's just ask them to complete the fidelity chart. They don't need to do the rest. All Tier 1 has to complete is the fidelity chart. • They would still need to indicate they are on the clearinghouse. • We will revise the renewal process – Tier 1 programs don't have to submit an entire application. <p>Carol motioned that we revise the adopted renewal process for expiring Tier 1 programs. Their renewal will only require a Tier 1 application. How can we make the process less painful? Who are we reaching with this message? Our board has said we need to get Tier 3 programs to Tier 2. Who are we having conversations with? Could we offer incentives? Is there any possibility of finding funding for a stipend for programs when they get on the Portfolio? This is a decision for the Policy committee. Oscar joined us.</p> <p>Tier 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This issue will still come up. We've never stated a local evaluation is necessary. Most have had an evaluation in another city/state/etc. ○ Do we want to require a local evaluation? ○ Even if their evaluation is local it may be out of date. Do they need a new evaluation altogether? ○ I wonder if we will keep too many groups off the Portfolio if we require a new evaluation. ○ New evaluations are costly and time intensive ○ What are the resources and timeline necessary? ○ We're getting a good deal and it's around \$18,000 per year plus 1.5 staff people. We've been doing it every year for 3 years. That cost doesn't include staff time. It's probably closer to \$75,000 if you include staff time. 	<p>Motion: Carol Second: Jennifer Yes: 10 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	<p>Upstream staff will call all Tier 1 programs.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For organizations that don't have a funder to pay for the evaluation, is it worth it? ○ What are our goals? What do we want from this? ○ As long as the evaluation is a good quality, even with Tier 2, we take a step back. What we want to know is, is their program still the same? Have there been changes? If so have you evaluated those changes? ○ Most of the Tier 2 issues involved cohorts not locality, their demographics were off. I think we can go longer than three years. They need to renew but could use an older evaluation. I think we want to know that they are making some sort of an impact. Are they getting to the outcomes they said they would? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● We envisioned the Institute would be able to help with local reports. ● Maybe we ask for outcome reporting? ● How would we do that without an evaluation? ● It's just a different level of reporting. ● Is that what we're all about? ● We want to move the needle on our Indicators. We're relying on research done elsewhere for Tier 1 programs. Tier 2 programs have never had that quality research. Are people really better off because of these programs? ● It seems like a big jump between Tier 2 and Tire 1. ● It seems like we're addressing a flaw by adding another hoop for them to jump through. ● I feel that it is sufficient that we have organizations at Tier 2 with a really robust evaluation we could let them use the same evaluation. But for how long? That is the question. ● It makes sense with Tier 3. They are emerging. It seems weird that the rigor has increased for Tier 2 reapplication. ● We need to set the bar for Tier 2. ● Tier 3 has to come up with an evaluation plan. Tier 2 has never had to write an evaluation plan. It's much harder to become a Tier 3 than a Tier 2. ● It's about the big picture. Not the burden on the organization. Tier 2 has shown that they are doing no harm. We don't know what Tier 3 has to offer. ● I think we could add that initially Tier 2 can have any evaluation. But they have to have a local evaluation down the line. ● We need to avoid a double standard. The standard needs to be the same for all Tier 2 programs. ● How about a Tier 2 and a Tier 2 with a gold star? 		

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It doesn't matter if there are no incentives. All that matters is that you are on the Portfolio. • It would be better to move the standard for the entire Portfolio. • We will continue this conversation later. • What if we reject an evaluation that was accepted before? How do we deal with that? There will be some people that won't pass the second time around. • Tier 2 could bypass the prerequisites and program description. • We could streamline the process by allowing them to send in their original application and articulate if it's the same or changed. • What we want to know is if the program is the same. • Is there a reason why they should submit a new application? • If there are things we have added to the application form, couldn't we just create a form that includes changes? • They could use the same literature review. What if it's past 15 years now? • What is the intent of this process? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The intent is to improve the quality of existing programs to have greater local impact. It's to provide information to funders and identify evidence informed programs. ○ For the review committee the purpose is to ensure that programs that claim to be high quality really are high quality. ○ Carol read definition for this committee from the by-laws. • We want to ensure there is no malfeasance. • We want to enhance evidence based practice • We want to encourage continual improvement. • For Tier 3 I have to show an evaluation plan, for Tier 2 I can use someone else's evaluation, for Tier 1 I don't have to show an evaluation. This seems backwards. • We know as a fact that clearinghouse programs will have positive outcomes. We don't know what Tier 3 is going to throw into the ring. • For some domains there is no way to become a Tier 1. I would think that even Tier 1 programs should have to do something to show that they are moving in the same direction. I don't believe we can say that if an organization follows a plan they will get an unwavering set of outcomes. • A lot of Tier 1 programs do have an ongoing evaluation. For example, AVANCE, has an ongoing national evaluation that shows they are implementing with fidelity. Nurse Family partnership has the same. There should be data that could assure this group that 		<p>Upstream staff will add this discussion to a future agenda.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>there is fidelity.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This may not be the case for all Tier 1 programs. Tier 1 is expensive. • It does seem backward in terms of the local data we're asking people to provide. I don't know if this is our scope. This may be better suited for the Policy Committee. • This committee is about implementation. We need some clarity about our goals from the Policy Committee. Do we have mixed purposes? • The portfolio shouldn't stifle grass roots movements. But we still need to verify the effectiveness of programs. We already know that Tier 1 programs are effective. • It seems that Tier 3 is set at the highest bar and Tier 1 the lowest. • Perhaps with Tier 1 we might want to ask if they can show us local results. • But what are we going to do with that? What if they're negative? Why would an organization share negative results? • Maybe we bring this conversation back to another meeting? • Some of these programs are expiring soon. We need some quick direction. • If nothing has changed all they need is an application form. And the literature review needs to be within 15 years. We can just pull their original application. • We can only deny them if they have an expired literature review or adaptations. Let's give them a fidelity chart like Tier 1 programs. • Can staff review the dates on the literature review and let them know if it's expired. • Are you all in favor of giving them an adaptation chart? We need to make sure we only have them submit what we can judge. • What if they get new reviewers and they slide off? • I think they have to meet the new standard. That's part of the process. • We could change the form. • What is the purpose of our renewal process? • Either as long as you haven't changed anything you can stay on or you have to submit a new application because our rigor has increased • There may not be value for people to reapply if they think they won't be able to stay on. Until we set a date in the future that everyone has in front of them for a more rigorous application we can't require a more rigorous application. • What if the changes don't correspond with the old evaluation? • We need to consider the merit of their outcomes. How are they changing our community? • We can only show short term or intermediate outcomes. • We could include a recommendation to review the logic model. 		<p>B.J. will create a new form for Tier 2 renewal.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to incentivize people to raise the bar. • I don't understand why they have to prove a Tier 1 program is effective locally. They paid for it and we have to accept the evidence that shows the program is proven to work. • What if that Tier 1 program isn't moving the needle in our community? • Could we all see a copy of the Indicators report? • Can we make connections between the programs and the needle being moved? • Yes, but how can we show that they're effecting the entire community? Maybe they only helped three people? • Is evidence based practice the solution to our problems? There is a holistic picture of a combination of factors. There are many things that go into fixing issues. Evidence informed practices are part of our tool box. • Schools alone won't solve the achievement gap. But we still focus on good quality instruction. • How do you evaluate the impact of something that is multi-layered? • We need to understand what we are doing on multiple levels. We are trying to help programs understand the levels and where they fit. <p>Tier 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Three years is appropriate. People knew it was time limited. We don't need to make any changes to the process. 		<p>Joni will send the committee a link to the copy online.</p>
Logic Model	<p>The committee reviewed the revised logic model. Dan motioned to approve the logic model.</p> <p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First two bullets in the outputs are actually outcomes. • I don't see anything that references the outcome for the Portfolio itself. – For example it will be seen as a trusted source for evidence informed practice in Sonoma County. This would be under short term outcomes. • What about third bulled under outputs? • Is increasing knowledge an outcome? • No it's a transformation. • The output is that as a committee you participate in ongoing learning activities. • Why do we have four new indicators? As Health Action and Upstream seek to align their efforts we accepted four of their indicators and they accepted four of our indicators. • Why are hip fractures on the indicators? Is this really something Upstream will help 	<p>Motion: Dan Second: Stephen Yes: 10 No: 0 Abstain: 0</p>	<p>B.J. will add this as the third bullet under outcomes.</p>

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<p>change?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Hip fractures are included because Upstream isn't only about children. Can we improve senior health and see a reduction in hip fractures? 		
Fidelity	<p>What do we expect in terms of fidelity?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Look at the Tier 1 fidelity chart. It's an off the shelf evidence based program. We asked the organization to identify their adherence to the model including activities, does/exposure, quality of program delivery and participant responsiveness. They have to show how it is implemented. B.J. summarized the Tier 1 fidelity chart. The committee reviewed <i>What Works</i>. On page 2 the language about acceptable adaptations is notable. This is the original source for the language used on our instructions. Some of the adaptations that we think are risky may not be and vice versa. We sometimes deny an application based on cultural mismatch? For example, juvenile delinquency programs as cited in <i>What Works</i>. What we don't know as reviewers is this level of nuance. We don't have this body of knowledge. Adding material is acceptable, but taking material away isn't. Fidelity is very complex. That's why we get different reactions from different reviewers. The committee got into groups and scored the Tier 1 applications. Discussion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> What was not acceptable for <i>adherence</i>? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the first application changes to staff training and participant engagement were not acceptable. We need more information on equality. What make an adaptation equal to the model? Format is important. The fidelity charts are much clearer than paragraph format. We need to be careful that organizations are not confusing outcomes with participant responsiveness. Are fidelity standards were developed by First 5 and LFA. Are they the right ones? <i>Dose</i> is how much a program is offered. We need to better articulate engagement on our forms. We should give examples that include attendance, motivation and feedback. 	None	Staff will update forms.
Public Comment	None	None	None
Next Meeting	<p>The next meeting will be on October 16 at 520 Mendocino Ave.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We will have a Tier 2 evaluation discussion in October. 	None	None

Topic	Discussion	Decision	Next Steps
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Can we also talk about Tier 2 or Tier 1 plus?○ Katie's request for a discussion on Tier 3 evaluation plans moving to acceptable Tier 2 evaluations will also be included in October's discussion.		
Adjourn	Adjourned at 3:30 pm.	None	None



UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

It is easier to build strong children than to fix broken lives.

Update Report for the Portfolio Review Committee

October 2013

Total number of programs approved to date for tier placement on the Portfolio:

Tier 1: 21 programs

Tier 2: 26 programs

Tier 3: 15 programs

Total: 62 programs

Number of organizations implementing or funding programs on the Portfolio: 73 organizations

Programs recently added to the Portfolio

	Approval Date	Program	Submitting Agency
1	9/16/13	Youth and Family Development through Martial Arts	Martial Arts Youth Institute (MAYi)
2	9/23/13	Perry Preschool	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County
3	9/25/13	Mentor Me Petaluma	Mentor Me Petaluma

Recent activity related to active submissions

	Submission Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Activity Date	Status
1	4/29/13	El Puente	Life Works of Sonoma	9/23/13	Technical assistance
2	5/17/13	Tackling Tough Skills	Goodwill Redwood Empire	9/6/13	Technical Assistance
3	6/28/13	Triple P Parenting	YWCA	9/2/13	Technical assistance
4	6/7/13	Triple P Parenting	Russian River Counselors	9/2/13	Technical assistance

Note: HSD staff also provide assistance to organizations preparing their applications. This assistance is reflected in the following table. The activity reflected here begins with a Portfolio submission.

Applications in progress but not submitted:

	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Communication
1	Farm Therapy	Forget Me Not Farms	10/3/13
2	Mentoring Program	Forget Me Not Farms	10/3/13
3	Neighborhood Listening Project	Listening for a Change	10/1/13
4	Girls' Circle	Jewish Family Services	9/13/13
5	TBD	Sonoma Valley Teen Services	9/6/13
6	TBD	CPI	6/24/13
7	TBD	Volunteer Center	6/24/13

Other active submissions with no recent activity

	Submission Date	Program	Submitting Agency	Last Activity Date	Status
1	5/9/13	Child Signature Program	Community Child Care Council of Sonoma County	4/15/13	Awaiting info from applicant
2	4/18/13	WHEEL Early Literacy Program	Community Action Partnership	5/16/13	Awaiting info from applicant
3	4/15/13	Motivational Interviewing	Sunny Hills Services	5/16/13	Awaiting info from applicant
4	4/3/13	CYO-Street Outreach Program	Breakout Prison Outreach dba California Youth Outreach	5/15/13	Awaiting info from applicant
5	2/5/13	Head Start	Community Action Partnership	2/22/13	Awaiting info from applicant
6	9/24/12	HUD-Veterans Affairs Supportive Housing	Interfaith Shelter Network	9/31/12	Awaiting info from applicant
7	9/3/12	Health Kids Sonoma County	Redwood Community Health Coalition	12/14/12	Awaiting info from applicant
8	6/29/12	Play Therapy	Petaluma People Services Center	9/25/12	Awaiting info from applicant
9	12/20/11	Recreation and Parks Afterschool Program	City of Santa Rosa	9/12/12	Awaiting info from applicant
10	12/14/11	Recreation and Parks Neighborhood Services Sports Program	City of Santa Rosa	9/12/12	Awaiting info from applicant
11	6/20/11	The Toolbox Project	Dovetail Learning, Inc.	7/13/12	Awaiting info from applicant

2 Fidelity*: How is the program implemented in Sonoma County with fidelity to the model program?

Fidelity is the extent to which a program is implemented in a way that adheres to the protocol or model of the originally developed and evaluated program. Programs that are implemented with fidelity can demonstrate that they match the model program in the following dimensions.

	Required by model program (please provide detailed description)	How you meet model program requirements (please provide detailed description)
Adherence: The extent to which the model's critical elements (core activities and methods necessary to achieve the outcomes desired) are implemented.		
Dose/exposure: The amount of program content received by participants.		
Quality of program delivery: The manner in which providers implement the program, relative to specifications in the model program.		
Participant responsiveness: The extent to which participants are engaged by and involved in the activities and content of the program. For example: tests to measure knowledge, opportunities to practice new skills, actual attendance, etc.		



Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs LOGIC MODEL



Problem 1: The social/economic and family/individual factors that can pose extraordinary challenges and barriers to children, families, and individuals are complex, inter-related, consistent, and generally evident early in a child's life. **Solution 1:** Evidence-based prevention programs mitigate these challenges.

Problem 2: Incorporating evidence-informed practices within organizations can be confusing, complex, and costly. Moreover, the lack of standardized approaches to evidence-informed practice among funders and regulatory bodies can be burdensome to service providers. **Solution 2:** Develop and implement a standardized approach to implementing evidence-informed practice.

ASSUMPTIONS AND THEORIES that guide our thinking

- The social/economic and family/individual factors that contribute to social problems are well documented and can be successfully mitigated with programs informed by evidence.
- The Board of Supervisors continues to include the Upstream Investments Policy as a Board priority.
- County Departments, community partners, and local funders promote investing early, wisely, and together in their organizational practices including strategic planning, policy decisions, budgeting, resource deployment, and contracting.
- The Sonoma County community is committed to and does provide an array of public and private prevention services to community members experiencing challenging circumstances.
- The Sonoma County community of funders and service providers share a value for evidence-informed services and share a common understanding of the components of evidence-informed practice which are articulated in the Portfolio criteria.
- Evidence-based practices exist and are available for Sonoma County organizations to replicate. Other research and evaluation also exists and can be used by Sonoma County organizations to inform program design, implementation, and evaluation.
- Technical assistance received by service providers improves organizational capacity
- National evidence-based clearinghouses maintain current and growing lists of evidence-based practices.

- There is local collective commitment to providing a comprehensive technical assistance program to expand local capacity to implement evidence informed practices in program design, implementation, and evaluation.

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS that may affect our success

Challenges may include the following:

- Service providers' incorporation of evidence into their practice
- Funders' use of the Portfolio as a funding criteria
- The Board of Supervisors' support of decisions made by the Review Committee and/or the Appeal Committee

SOURCES

- Greenwood, P. (2008). Prevention and Intervention Programs for Juvenile Offenders. *Future of Children*, 18 (2), 203.
- Wolfe, B., Tefft, N. (2005). Child Interventions that may lead to Increased Economic Growth: A report to the Pew Charitable Trusts. *La Follette: The Policy Report* 16, (2), 12.
- Mason, P., Prior, D. (2009). *The Children's Fund and the prevention of crime and anti-social behavior* (Abstract DOI: 10.1177/1748895808092430), 282.
- Myers, D., Farrell, A. (2008). Reclaiming lost opportunities: Applying public health models in juvenile justice. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30 (10), 1172.
- Orszag, P. (October 7, 2009). *Increased emphasis on program evaluations*. Memorandum for the heads of executive departments and agencies: Washington, DC: Office of Management and Budget.

INPUTS	OUTPUTS	OUTCOMES		
		SHORT TERM	INTERMEDIATE	LONG TERM
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitment by the Board of Supervisors to support Portfolio and Appeal Committee decisions. • Commitment by funders to use evidence-informed practices and the Portfolio as the basis for their funding criteria. • Private and organizational volunteers that are representative of Sonoma County who will commit the time necessary to serve on the Portfolio Committee. • Staff to support the Portfolio (1 Admin Aide and 1 manager) • Staff to provide technical assistance on evidence-informed practice to service providers • Commitment by service providers to dedicate resources to submitting their programs to the Portfolio. 	<p>The Portfolio Review Committee engages in the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reviews applications and renewals to the Portfolio in accordance with the Portfolio Review and Decision Process and determine Tier Placement for each application. • Participates in ongoing professional learning activities • Publishes a list of programs that meet the criteria for each Tier. • Ensures that the Portfolio Submission Criteria and the Portfolio Review and Decision Process continue to meet County policy and accepted industry practices related to evidence-based practice • Maintains documentation that fully describes the committee’s processes and change in thinking over time for the purpose of facilitating replication. • Promotes transparency and public accountability by ensuring opportunity for public access to and input to Portfolio activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Review Committee members will continually increase their own knowledge of evidence-informed practice and will share this increased knowledge through Portfolio activities and within their own sphere of influence. • The number of submissions to the Portfolio and the number of approved programs on the Portfolio will increase. • The portfolio will be viewed as a trusted source for evidence informed practice in Sonoma County. <p>Local service-delivery providers will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve their capacity to incorporate evidence in their program design, implementation and evaluation. • Increase their capacity to apply for and receive funding for prevention programs. • Deliver more evidence-informed prevention-based services. • Expand referrals to effective and cost beneficial prevention programs. <p>Local funders will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify local effective prevention programs and target funding and resources to these programs. • Promote replication and scalability of successful and cost beneficial prevention programs. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Children, families and individuals facing extraordinary challenges and barriers will be more likely to succeed as a result of increasingly more effective services. • Sonoma County will publish its experiences and contribute to the body of knowledge about implementation science. • Sonoma County public resources are invested in building social capital, resulting in more resources dedicated to supporting prevention-focused policies and interventions than in the need to fund existing community problems. <p>The following risk factors will decline in the community:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Societal and Economic <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poverty and Racial/Ethnic Disparities • Adverse community conditions • Punitive opinions, policies, and laws that advance incarceration over prevention • Family and Individual <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Family dysfunction • Early anti-social behavior • Negative peer influences 	<p>We will collectively improve community indicators of success resulting in the following outcomes:</p> <p>Increase in...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre-school attendance • 3rd grade reading • 3rd grade math • High school completion • Higher education access and completion • Housing affordability • Youth connectedness • Health insurance coverage • Fruit and vegetable consumption • Physical activity • Dental visits <p>Decrease in...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Child maltreatment • Youth binge drinking • Youth alcohol/drug use • Youth depression • Youth tobacco use • Teen births • Childhood obesity • Homelessness • Juvenile arrests • Adult arrests • Domestic violence • Gang membership • Poverty • Hip fractures • Unemployment

Portfolio of Model Upstream Investments: Program Renewal Policy

Revised September 30, 2013

Requirements for Renewal Submissions

After an organization's program has been on the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs for three years, all future applications for that program at the same Tier for which it was approved must be submitted as a Renewal Application, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the renewal submission. The renewal process for each Tier is detailed below.

After an organization's program has been on the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs for three years and the organization wishes to submit a future application for that program at a different Tier from which it was previously approved, the organization must submit a New Application for this program, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the new submission.

Renewal Process for Programs Currently Approved as Tier 1

1. An organization with a program that is approved on the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs as Tier 1 has three years from the date of approval to submit a Tier 1 Renewal Application for this program, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the Tier 1 renewal submission.
2. All organizations with approved Tier 1 programs will receive emailed notices regarding the date their programs will expire as approved Tier 1 Portfolio Programs, the policies regarding renewal, and specific types of technical assistance available to help them submit a Tier 1 Portfolio Renewal Application. These email notices will be sent 24, 12, 6, and 3 months prior to a program's expiration date.
3. Organizations submitting a Tier 1 program for renewal should complete the Program Description Renewal Form and the Tier 1 Renewal Form. These forms request for the organization to provide any changes in the program over the past three years, including changes in the program's fidelity and adaptations, and measurable outcomes that have occurred. It is not necessary to complete the Prerequisites Form the organization submitted with its previous Portfolio application. All Tier 1 program renewal applications will be evaluated by the Portfolio Review Committee according to the approved procedures that are in place at the time of the Tier 1 renewal application.
4. If within three years of an organization having an approved Tier 1 Portfolio program, the Clearinghouse that originally included the program drops the program from its approved list or changes its rating so that the program is no longer an acceptable Portfolio program, then the organization will be able to submit a Tier 2 Application for the program, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the new Tier 2 submission. All new Tier 2 program applications will be evaluated by the Portfolio Review Committee according to the approved procedures that are in place at the time of the Tier 2 application.

5. If within three years of having an approved Tier 1 program, an organization does not submit a Tier 1 Renewal Application for the program, that program will be removed from the Portfolio of Upstream Programs. Organizations with a program that has been removed from the Portfolio for failure to reapply within the required three-year application renewal period may submit a Portfolio Renewal application at any time, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the Portfolio re-submission.

Renewal Process for Programs Currently Approved as Tier 2

1. An organization with a program that is approved on the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs as Tier 2 has three years from the date of approval to submit a Tier 2 Renewal Application for this program, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the Tier 2 renewal submission.
2. All organizations with approved Tier 2 programs will receive emailed notices regarding the date their programs will expire as approved Tier 2 Portfolio Programs, the policies regarding renewal, and specific types of technical assistance available to help them submit a Tier 2 Portfolio Renewal Application. These email notices will be sent 24, 12, 6, and 3 months prior to a program's expiration date.
3. Organizations submitting a Tier 2 program for renewal should complete the Program Description Renewal Form and the Tier 2 Renewal Form. These forms request for the organization to provide any changes in the program over the past three years, including an opportunity to submit an updated evaluation report based on data collected during the past three years. It is not necessary to complete the Prerequisites Form the organization submitted with its previous Portfolio application. All Tier 2 program renewal applications will be evaluated by the Portfolio Review Committee according to the approved procedures that are in place at the time of the Tier 2 renewal application.
4. If within three years of having an approved Tier 2 program, an organization does not submit a Tier 2 Renewal Application for the program, that program will be removed from the Portfolio of Upstream Programs. Organizations with a program that has been removed from the Portfolio for failure to reapply within the required three-year application renewal period may submit a Portfolio Renewal application at any time, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the Portfolio re-submission.

Renewal Process for Programs Currently Approved as Tier 3

1. An organization with a program that is approved on the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs as Tier 3 has three years from the date of approval to submit a Tier 2 Application for this program, using the instructions and application forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the Tier 2 submission. In the three years after having a program approved as a Tier 3 program, the organization is expected to implement the Evaluation Plan that was included in its original Tier 3 application and develop a robust Program Manual. All Tier 2 program submissions for programs that have previously been approved as Tier 3 will be evaluated by the Portfolio Review Committee according to the approved procedures that are in place at the time of the Tier 2 application.

2. All organizations with approved Tier 3 programs will receive emailed notices regarding the date their programs will expire as approved Tier 3 Portfolio Programs, the policies regarding renewal, and specific types of technical assistance available to help them implement the Evaluation Plan that was approved as part of their Tier 3 Portfolio Application. These email notices will be sent 24, 12, 6, and 3 months prior to a program's expiration date.
3. If extenuating circumstances, such as significant changes in leadership, governance, programming, physical environment, and funding, have made it impossible for the organization to have executed its approved Evaluation Plan or created a robust Program Manual within three years, the organization may submit the program again to be on the Portfolio using a Tier 3 Renewal Form and a Program Description Renewal Form. The Tier 3 Renewal Form asks for identification of extenuating circumstances causing the organization to re-submit as a Tier 3 application and requests that the organization describe changes in the program over the past 3 years. It is not necessary to complete the Prerequisites Form the organization submitted with its previous Portfolio application. All Tier 3 program renewal applications for programs that have previously been approved as Tier 3 will be evaluated by the Portfolio Review Committee according to the approved procedures that are in place at the time of the Tier 3 renewal application.
4. If an organization has a program that has been approved to be on the portfolio as a Tier 3 program for two consecutive three-year periods, it must submit a Tier 2 Application for the program within three years of the date of the second approval, using the instructions and application forms from the Upstream Investments website at the time of the Tier 2 submission. If an organization does not submit a Tier 2 Application for a program that has been on the Portfolio as a Tier 3 program for six consecutive years, that program will be removed from the Portfolio of Upstream Programs. Organizations with a program that has been removed from the Portfolio for failure to submit a Tier 2 Application after being on the Portfolio as a Tier 3 program for six consecutive years may submit a Tier 2 Application at any time, using the approved forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the Portfolio Tier 2 submission.
5. If within three years of having an approved Tier 3 program, an organization does not submit either a Tier 2 Application for that program or a Tier 3 Renewal Application describing extenuating circumstances causing a Tier 3 renewal submission, that program will be removed from the Portfolio of Upstream Programs. Organizations with a program that has been removed from the Portfolio for failure to reapply within the required three-year application renewal period and have an extenuating circumstance causing a Tier 3 renewal submission may submit a Tier 3 Renewal Application at any time, using the approved forms posted on the Upstream Investments website at the time of the Portfolio re-submission.



Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Renewal Form: PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

INSTRUCTIONS: To re-apply to the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs, submit (1) this Program Description Form and (2) the appropriate Tier Renewal Form with the requested attachments to Info@SonomaUpstream.org or mail to Upstream, 3600 Westwind Blvd., Santa Rosa, CA 95403.

It is not necessary to re-submit the Pre-Requisite application.

Complete ALL sections. Detailed information about each question is available in the separate INSTRUCTIONS. Assistance in completing this application is available and encouraged. Call Upstream at 565-5800 to indicate your intent to submit this form and to receive assistance.

1. Program Name _____

2. Organization _____

3. Contact name _____

4. Contact phone number _____

5. Contact e-mail address _____

6. Program website (if one exists) _____

7. Program Design: Identify any changes to your program since the program was approved for inclusion in the Portfolio three years ago regarding: goals, strategies/activities, target population, outreach strategies and anticipated outcomes (anticipated benefit to client, county, society). The program description should be based on the program's logic model; clearly reflect the findings from the literature review; align with the content of the program's manual (for Tier 2) or policy and procedures document (for Tier 3); and incorporate the evaluation outcomes (for Tier 2) or elements of the evaluation design (for Tier 3).

If there have been no changes at all over the past three years, check the *no Change* box.

No Change: There have been no changes in Program Design over the past three years.

Program design changes are detailed below.

8. Program service location(s):

(a) List all locations in Sonoma County where this program is **currently** physically provided to clients:

(b) Identify the Supervisorial District for each location (if known):

Supervisorial District(s): Check all Districts where services are **currently** physically provided

_____ 1st District (Susan Gorin)

_____ 4th District (Mike McGuire)

_____ 2nd District (David Rabbitt)

_____ 5th District (Efren Carrillo)

_____ 3rd District (Shirlee Zane)

9. Clients: Describe the number of and demographics of **clients in this program during the most recent fiscal year**. It is acceptable and encouraged to cut and paste from a report prepared for another purpose:

10. Implementers: List all organization(s) that are **currently** implementing this program under this application:

11. Funding source(s)/Budget:

a) Provide total **current fiscal year program budget** amount (details not necessary) under this application:

b) Provide a list of all funders for this program under this application in the **most recent fiscal year**:

12. Impact of being on the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs: What has been the impact to your organization for having this program on the Portfolio?



UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

It is easier to build strong children than to fix broken lives.

Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Renewal Form: TIER 1

Program Name _____

Organization _____

Date program was originally accepted on the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs _____

1. **Evidence-based Clearinghouse:** Which of the following clearinghouses include this program as evidence-based? *(Please insert the specific web address to the program on the clearinghouse.)* If the reviewers cannot find the program on the clearinghouse this application will be returned to you.

- _____ [Administration on Aging](#)
- _____ [American Diabetes Association](#)
- _____ [California Evidence-Based Clearinghouse](#)
- _____ [Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence](#)
- _____ [Child Trends LINKS](#)
- _____ [Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy](#)
- _____ [Cochrane Collaboration Library of Systematic Reviews](#)
- _____ [Diffusion of Effective Behavioral Interventions - DEBI](#)
- _____ [Guide to Community Preventive Services](#)
- _____ [Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention](#)
- _____ [SAMHSA's National Registry of Evidence-Based Programs and Practices](#)
- _____ [What Works Clearinghouse](#)
- _____ Other (please list)

2 **Fidelity***: How is the program implemented in Sonoma County with fidelity to the model program?

Fidelity is the extent to which a program is implemented in a way that adheres to the protocol or model of the originally developed and evaluated program. Programs that are implemented with fidelity can demonstrate that they match the model program in the following dimensions.

	Required by model program (please provide detailed description)	How you meet model program requirements (please provide detailed description)
Adherence: The extent to which the model's critical elements (core activities and methods necessary to achieve the outcomes desired) are implemented.		
Dose/exposure: The amount of program content received by participants.		
Quality of program delivery: The manner in which providers implement the program, relative to specifications in the model program.		
Participant responsiveness: The extent to which participants are engaged by and involved in the activities and content of the program. For example: tests to measure knowledge, opportunities to practice new skills, actual attendance, etc.		

* If you participate in an ongoing, third party audit or accreditation process, contact us before completing this form.

3. **Adaptations**

a. Have you adapted the program from the model program?

_____ No

_____ Yes (go to question 3b)

b. In what ways have you adapted the program from the model program?
(Please provide specific detailed information.)

4. Outcomes

Describe the measurable outcomes related to your logic model that have occurred in Sonoma County over the past three years as a result of implementing this program.



UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

It is easier to build strong children than to fix broken lives.

Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Renewal Form: TIER 2

Program Name _____

Organization _____

Date program was originally accepted on the Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs _____

1. **Literature Review:** Check the appropriate box and attach an updated literature review, if necessary.

The literature review submitted for our previous Portfolio application was written within the past 15 years and is still relevant. We are continuing to use this same literature review to inform our evidence-informed practices for this program.

We have updated our literature review and it is attached.

2. **Logic Model:** Check the appropriate box and attach an updated logic model, if necessary.

The logic model submitted for our previous Portfolio application is still relevant. We are continuing to use this same logic model as the foundation for this program.

We have updated our logic model and it is attached.

3. **Manual:** Check the appropriate box and, if you have a new version of your manual, attach the electronic version of the manual or the table of contents if your manual is not electronic. You may be asked to provide more information regarding your revised manual.

The manual submitted for our previous Portfolio application is still relevant. We are continuing to use this same manual to guide the implementation of this program.

We have updated our manual and have attached one of the following:

The electronic version of our manual

The table of contents, since our manual is not electronic

4. **Evaluation**: Check the appropriate box and attach an updated evaluation report, if necessary.
- We have not conducted an evaluation on the implementation of this program over the past three years. The only evaluation report we have is the one submitted with our previous application to the Portfolio.
 - We have conducted an evaluation on the Sonoma County implementation of this program over the past three years and it is attached.
 - An updated evaluation of this program has been conducted by an evaluator over the past three years and is attached. This evaluation:
 - Does include evaluation results on the Sonoma County implementation.
 - Does not include evaluation results on the Sonoma County implementation.
5. **Cohorts**: If you are submitting an updated evaluation, identify at least two cohorts. (include dates, services provided, locations and # of clients)



UPSTREAM INVESTMENTS

It is easier to build strong children than to fix broken lives.

Portfolio of Model Upstream Programs Renewal Form: TIER 3

Program Name _____

Organization _____

Date program was originally accepted on the Portfolio of Model Upstream programs _____

An organization with a program that is approved on the Portfolio of Upstream Programs as Tier 3 has 3 years from the date of approval to submit a Tier 2 Application for this program. If extenuating circumstances, such as significant changes in leadership, governance, programming, physical environment, and funding, have made it impossible for the organization to have executed its approved Evaluation Plan or created a robust Program Manual within 3 years, the organization may submit the program again as a new Tier 3 Program application. If an organization does not submit a Tier 2 Application for a program that has been on the Portfolio as a Tier 3 program for six consecutive years, that program will be removed from the Portfolio of Upstream Programs.

1. Extenuating Circumstances: Describe the extenuating circumstances that are causing you to re-apply as a Tier 3 Program:

2. **Literature Review:** Check the appropriate box and attach an updated literature review, if necessary.
- The literature review submitted for our previous Portfolio application was written within the past 15 years and is still relevant. We are continuing to use this same literature review to inform our evidence-informed practices for this program.
 - We have updated our literature review and it is attached.
3. **Logic Model:** Check the appropriate box and attach an updated logic model, if necessary.
- The logic model submitted for our previous Portfolio application is still relevant. We are continuing to use this same logic model as the foundation for this program.
 - We have updated our logic model and it is attached.
3. **Policy & Procedures:** Check the appropriate box and, if you have a new version of your Policy & Procedures document, attach the electronic version of the document.
- The Policy & Procedures document submitted for our previous Portfolio application is still relevant. We are continuing to use this same document to guide the implementation of this program.
 - We have updated our Policies & Procedures document and it is attached.
4. **Evaluation Plan:** Check the appropriate box and attach an updated evaluation plan, if necessary.
- The evaluation plan submitted for our previous Portfolio application is still relevant.
 - We have updated our evaluation plan and it is attached.



Tier 3 Evaluation Plan Instructions:

Evaluation Plan: Good program evaluations assess performance, measure impacts on families and communities, and document successes. With evaluation information, programs are able to direct limited resources to where they are most needed and most effective for their clients and communities. Tier 3 programs may not have a completed evaluation but are conducting or have a plan to conduct, an evaluation. Programs can remain on Tier 3 for up to three years after the development of an evaluation plan. After three years, if the evaluation has not been completed, the program will no longer qualify for Tier 3. A credible evaluation plan will include all of the following components.

- a. **PURPOSE:** Reason(s) that the evaluation is being conducted.
- b. **AUDIENCE:** Intended audience and their information or decision making needs.
- c. **QUESTIONS:** Research questions that the evaluation will answer.
- d. **RESOURCES:** Resources needed and available for the evaluation, including timelines.
- e. **CHALLENGES:** Anticipated challenges to completing the evaluation and how they will be managed.
- f. **LITERATURE REVIEW:** A review of the literature that will inform the evaluation decision.
- g. **METHODS:** Planned data collection methods (for example, surveys, interviews, document review, observation, focus groups) with attention to confidentiality, anonymity, consent, objectivity, sampling, pilot testing, reliability/validity, and timelines.
- h. **ANALYSIS:** Plan for appropriate descriptive and inferential analysis.
- i. **RECOMMENDATIONS:** Plan for the creation of conclusions and recommendations.
- j. **DISSEMINATION:** Plan that identifies when and how to disseminate the report and to what audiences.

Tier 2 Evaluation Instructions:

Evaluation: Good evaluations assess performance, measure impacts on families and communities, and document successes. With evaluation information, programs are able to direct limited resources to where they are most needed and most effective for their clients and communities. The evaluation should suggest positive outcomes and reflect the design of the program being submitted. A credible evaluation will result in a report that includes all of the following components.

- a. **PURPOSE:** Reason(s) that the evaluation was conducted.
- b. **AUDIENCE:** Intended audience and their information or decision making needs.
- c. **QUESTIONS:** Research questions that the evaluation answered.
- d. **LITERATURE REVIEW:** A review of the literature that informed the development of the program and the evaluation.
- e. **METHODS:** Data collection methods (for example, surveys, interviews, document review, observation, focus groups) with an explanation of confidentiality, anonymity, consent, objectivity, sampling, pilot testing, and reliability/validity.
- f. **ANALYSIS:** Appropriate descriptive and inferential analysis.
- g. **RECOMMENDATIONS:** Discussion of the analysis, conclusions, and recommendations.