



Maria Su, Psy.D.
Executive Director



Edwin M. Lee
Mayor

April 11, 2017

Re: Response to Public Comment on the Draft of the Services Allocation Plan, 3.07.17

Public feedback regarding the Service Allocation Plan (SAP) was accepted at the March 13 meeting of the DCYF Oversight and Advisory Committee, and through an online feedback form that was open to the public from March 8 through March 20. DCYF received a total of 51 public comments, which were reviewed by the DCYF staff and organized into seven categories. Below is a description of the seven categories. Additional responses were provided for some of questions.

RFP: Many comments and questions were coded as **RFP**. These comments were suggestions about services that DCYF should fund, questions about the general structure of the RFP, and questions about the process to apply for funding across multiple Service Areas.

- Comments related to services DCYF should fund will be taken into consideration during RFP development. Not all suggestions will be included in the RFP.
- DCYF is still determining the structure of the RFP application process.
 - DCYF is examining options to reduce the burden on agencies interested in submitting multiple proposals. Agencies with distinct programs will need to submit separate proposals for each program.
 - Programs that provide a range of services within the same program will be asked to submit one proposal for the program that describes the range of services. Given the high number of proposals we anticipate receiving, DCYF may not be able to fully fund all services a program provides.

Appendix C: Several comments were related to how DCYF's current funding aligns with the 2018-23 Service Areas. Appendix C was added to the SAP to provide more detail about how the investments in DCYF's current funding strategies map to the 2018-23 Service Areas. Please note: although DCYF's current funding strategies may correlate with 2018-23 Service Areas, this does not indicate that current funding strategies will be included in their present form in the RFP. DCYF is in the process of refining existing strategies and developing new strategies, and details related to this process cannot be discussed prior to the release of the RFP.

In addition, several commenters requested to know how the current allocation at the strategy level compared to the proposed allocation at the Service Area level. Given that there is growth in the Children & Youth Fund, new strategies are being developed, and existing strategies are being refined, this funding comparison would not offer an accurate picture of funding in the upcoming RFP.

Response to Public Comment on the Draft of the Services Allocation Plan, 3.07.17

Appendix D: Appendix D was added to the SAP in order to provide more detail about interdepartmental investments. Appendix D provides additional information about DCYF's FY 16-17 programmatic work orders, which will be referred to as "interdepartmental partnerships" going forward. While interdepartmental partnership funds are subject to annual negotiation between departments, the general expectation is that all current arrangements will continue.

API Concern: DCYF received several comments from members of the Asian Pacific Islander (API) Council about the high rate of poverty among San Francisco's API community. DCYF Director Maria Su has addressed these concerns in a memo to the Board Members of the API Council. The memo is available on the [OAC page of DCYF website](#).

ECE: Comments coded **ECE** were related to the allocation for Early Care and Education. DCYF is well aware of the myriad ECE-related issues in San Francisco, including the high cost of providing quality ECE programming, insufficient state and federal resources for ECE services, the inadequate number of childcare slots, and the effect this has on the workforce.

DCYF has increased its investment in ECE and has prioritized its funding for subsidies to help low-income families access quality care. We fully acknowledge that more resources are needed for ECE services in San Francisco, and we are committed to working with the Office of Early Care & Education (OECE) to determine how to bring more stability to the ECE system.

Mental Health: DCYF received a few comments expressing concern that the allocation for Emotional Well-Being does not reflect the level of need for mental health services that was identified in our Community Needs Assessment (CNA). DCYF recognizes that access to mental health services is a consistent concern expressed by families and service providers.

Much of DCYF's investment in mental health services is allocated to interdepartmental partnerships in Service Areas other than Emotional Well-Being. Appendix D of the SAP provides more details about these investments. DCYF's primary interdepartmental partnership related to mental health services is with the Department of Public Health (DPH), and DCYF will continue its work with DPH to improve coordination of and access to mental health services.

Some Service Areas in the RFP will include strategies for high-need populations, and will allow for a range of supportive services to address mental health needs.

Miscellaneous: Several questions did not fit into any of the other categories, and responses to these comments are provided in the Public Feedback Table provided below.

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>Will the Out of School Time (OST) would include the Excel and Beacon Programs in the \$26 million and if so, how much is designated to the Excel program versus Non-Excel and Non-Beacon Programs? Also, now that Specialized Teen is absorbed into OST we would like OST money to be increased being that we are being asked to serve more teens. We have K-8 and we receive a certain chunk. We do not receive for Specialized Teen. Now, if we are looking at Specialized Teens that would need to be increased in the allocations.</p>	RFP & Appendix C	Specialized Teen was not moved into OST.
<p>It would be helpful to know how the new service categories line up with the old ones and how/whether the funding allocation per area has changed (or not).</p>	Appendix C	
<p>Service Provider Working Group *Only for Justice involved youth vs. Continuum of Care. -What seems in the SAP related to the specific service area is in conflict with what you understand to be true based on your daily work? This feels like once again siloing of Justice involved youth/TAY with no secondary prevention or aftercare. And it suggests a reduction in funds (??) need comparison between last SAP, current (FY1617), new SAP by strategy. -Enrichment, Leadership & Skill Building Service Area What are we excited to see discussed in the SAP for the specific service area? Seeing the arts explicitly named as an important component; Seeing TAY included in the category, seeing the integration of leadership and other specialized programs in this category; Appreciate role of leadership in elementary ages as well as middle & high school. -What is missing that should be highlighted in the SAP for the specific service area? *Need comparison of current funding with past funding - last SAP, current (FY1617), new SAP by strategy; Need transparency re interdepartmental partnerships“ how much is work ordered to which agencies, for what purpose and any used for community grants; If an organization has not used RBA in the past, with they need to have evidence of using RBA (indicators) in the proposal?; Which outcomes will a CBO be accountable for in a merged service areas?</p>	Appendix C & D	Justice system involved youth and TAY will be able to access a range of programs across several service areas. Also a program does not have to be funded in Justice Services in order to work with youth or TAY in the justice system.
<p>Budget allocation: In terms of evaluating the current budget allocation by categories in \$ and also proportion (%) of this draft SAP, can DCYF provide a comparison with the past 5 year budget allocation breakdown by category (noting that there might be new categories in the current draft SAP.) What areas increased and what areas have been reduced, if any?</p>	Appendix C	
<p>How do the new allocations by service area compare to current allocations? How much of the allocations represent funding currently going to CBOs or work order to other departments versus unallocated? Are the funding allocations to inter-departmental partnerships versus direct grants already set? If CBO responses to the RFP present potentially more effective strategies to meet results and indicators would DCYF consider increasing the portion to community based strategies and if so how will that determination be made?</p>	Appendix C & D	
<p>The plan totally left out the Asian population who meet the poverty guideline in SF. Over 35 % Asians live in poverty and a high percentage live in the west side of the city. We just heard statistics from HSA showing over 30% of the MediCal low income families are Asians. Please review existing data that was sent to DCYF and add Asians to your priority list. Thank you.</p>	API Concern	

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>I see that Treasure Island has the highest percentage of children living under 300% of poverty, but the second and third are Chinatown and Tenderloin, and both neighborhoods are not in your priority plan, especially Chinese, Vietnamese, Cambodian, Laos, Mongolian, South Asian and the Arab families living in these neighborhoods. HSA has just released its data that the Chinese community has the most low income families living in San Francisco (33% Chinese) as well as Pacific Islander (over 40%). Please consider this data when planning for allocation, to include the Chinese community, Chinatown and Tenderloin neighborhoods as priorities.</p>	API Concern	
<p>I am very surprised that I do not see that Asian communities are not included in this plan. Asians make up over 30% of San Francisco and while some Asians do well, Asians also have the highest poverty rate of any racial/ethnic group in the city at 43%. Poverty is a key indicator for unmet needs of communities. Immigration status is as well and Asians have many English language learners. Please prioritize low-income Asians in the Allocation plan!</p>	API Concern	
<p>In addition, when considering "priority populations" DCYF must account for the recent data compiled by the San Francisco Human Services Agency, which found that 42% of San Francisco's low income families (100% FPL) are Asian Pacific Islander. This data is consistent with the growing trend of API families living in poverty and is particularly alarming given that less than a one-third have enrolled in CalWorks and other programs which provide support for poor families.</p>	API Concern	
<p>"Concentrated need" should also include "Asians" as part of the API (Asian Pacific Islander) community noting that that 35% of the API (Asian Pacific Islanders) population in San Francisco are living in poverty. The Human Services Agency highlighted that 32% of the SF's low-income families are Chinese and 42% of them are API. Therefore, Asians should be listed with Pacific Islanders, African American, and Hispanic/Latino as a Concentrated Need. In addition, please note that 30% of Asians living in poverty resides in the Westside neighborhoods.</p>	API Concern	

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>As a service provider working on the front lines of youth violence prevention in the Asian/Pacific Islander (API) community, I am extremely concerned about the exclusion of Asian youth from DCYF's priority populations. Upon review of the Draft SAP, it seems to me that research regarding the Asian American community in San Francisco was not taken into account. For instance, while APIs account for about 36% of San Francisco's population, 42% of San Francisco's low-income families are API and 32% of them are specifically Chinese. Almost 30% of Asian families in poverty live in Westside neighborhoods, though these neighborhoods do not appear densely low-income on the attached map. I am interested in hearing more about the methodology used to identify the communities in need, given that a significant portion of the Asian community is underserved but Asians were still left out of the plan.</p> <p>Statistics aside, from my work in the Asian community, I can name several community- and culturally-specific factors to assert that this population deserves resources and attention. With respect to gender-based violence (such as teen dating violence and sexual assault), Asian youth face unique cultural barriers to assistance, such as patriarchal norms, shame-oriented values, racist and gendered socialization (namely, growing up with the stereotypes that Asian women are sex objects and Asian men somehow need to prove their manhood), and stigmatization of these topics. The omission of Asian youth also seems downright contradictory when considering that several characteristics of increased need are common among Asians in San Francisco, including being English Learners, undocumented, LGBTQ, exposed to violence/abuse/trauma, and disconnected from school. Indeed, in surveys, 57% of surveyed Asian Bay Area teens reported that they would not know where to turn to for help with an abusive relationship, and 100% of surveyed agencies with services for API youth agreed that the Bay Area lacks interpersonal violence prevention services for the API community. DCYF's proposed funding areas of education, enrichment, and employment are indubitably important, but by neglecting such a pressing issue and disadvantaged population, the plan becomes problematic.</p>	API Concern	
<p>Leaving out Asian Americans living below the poverty level (30% of our population) as a priority is a terrible oversight. Although Chinatown is shown on a map as having the highest level of poverty, the neighborhood is not listed in the text, again signaling that some sort of "model minority" is at work on the part of the advisory committee.</p>	API Concern	
<p>We would like to see DCYF incorporate Asians in their concentrated need. 35% of the API population in SF are living in poverty. And nearly 30% of Asians living in poverty resides in Westside neighborhoods. HSA has highlighted that 32% of SF's low-income families are Chinese and 42% of them are API.</p>	API Concern	
<p>The Draft Services Allocation Plan does not include Asian Americans as a priority population. 35% of Asian Pacific Islanders (API) in SF are living in poverty. And nearly 30% of Asians living in poverty resides in Westside neighborhoods. HSA has highlighted that 32% of SF's low-income families are Chinese and 42% of them are API. The API population is deeply underserved. As a nonprofit that elevates underserved communities, the perception is that API communities are doing well and are a model minority, even though the data states otherwise.</p>	API Concern	

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>I have the following feedback regarding the DCYF's Draft Services Allocation Plan that establishes the department's funding priorities, funding allocation and strategies for the next 5 yeras. Currently, as the Draft SAP stands, the priority areas are listed as: low-income neighborhoods, African American, Hispanic/Latino, and Pacific Islander children, youth and families, and disconnected transitional. This however, leaves out Asian populations.</p> <p>APIs make up 33% of San Francisco. 35% of the API population in SF are living in poverty. In addition, nearly 30% of Asians living in poverty resides in Westside neighborhoods of the city. The Human Service Agency of San Francisco has highlighted that 32% of SF's low-income families are Chinese and 42% of them are API. Furthermore, the identified low-income neighborhoods of the city (Chinatown, Tenderloin, Western Addition, Visitacion Valley, McLaren Park, and Bayview Hunter's Point) are neighborhoods with large populations of Asian residents, many of whom who fit many of the characteristics of increased needs highlighted in the SAP report. By excluding Asians from the priority populations with concentrated needs, the SAP neglects the needs of Asian constituents of the city and would lead to a disadvantaged allocation of resources for this community.</p>	API Concern	
<p>Please include Asian as part of your priority area. 35% of the API (Asian Pacific Islander) population in SF are living in poverty. And nearly 30% of Asians living in poverty resides in Westside neighborhoods. HSA has highlighted that 32% of SF's low-income families are Chinese and 42% of them are API.</p>	API Concern	
<p>Please add Asians the priority areas as 35% of the API population in SF are living in poverty.</p>	API Concern	
<p>"Concentrated need" should also include "Asians" as part of the API (Asian Pacific Islander) community noting that that 35% of the API (Asian Pacific Islanders) population in San Francisco are living in poverty. The Human Services Agency highlighted that 32% of the SF's low-income families are Chinese and 42% of them are API. Therefore, Asians should be listed with Pacific Islanders, African American, and Hispanic/Latino as a Concentrated Need. In addition, please note that 30% of Asians living in poverty resides in the Westside neighborhoods.</p>	API Concern	
<p>Finally, for comprehensive programs there are some challenges with tracking services. For example, with wraparound services and with tutoring and mentoring, sometimes they do go hand in hand. In many other programs they are more wraparound versus one offs. Some of our youth participate in one program and going to the next, it is more of a continuum. How do we track this, looking through the lens of DCYF? How is this going to be addressed?</p>	RFP	

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>DCYF's Youth Advisory Board stated the following: On Friday, March 10th the DCYF Youth Advisory Board opened their meeting to the public, inviting youth leaders from across the city to a presentation of DCYF's Draft Services Allocation Plan. After reviewing each Service Area we took a minute to ask clarifying questions and share what stood out to us. The following includes highlights and recommendations from our discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In Justice Services, we need services specifically for justice prevention if there are not already some. There are a lot of funds in this area and many programs applying to this grant. -In Youth Workforce Development (YWD), there needs to be an increase in early career exposure for younger youth and more opportunities for them to tap into their passions and realize their potential. Also, utilizing YWD programs as an opportunity to address racial and gender disconnects in specific fields/career paths. -In Mentorship, mentors need to reflect the youth for example race, community, youth-relatedness. Also, mentorship needs to be relevant, aware, and intentional because if it isn't it could be harmful. -In Family Empowerment, we found it super important for strengthening and creating meaningful connections in both family structure and programming context. We really like this service area. 	RFP	
<p>We were very heartened to see a lot of important practices included in the SAP, including Family Engagement, the calling out of undocumented students, and the focus on mental health. I have a process request that hopefully the RFP will clearly outline-how a program like ours with wraparound can best address multiple service areas without having to apply to different areas. We were very heartened to see that there was language about getting children outdoors, moving around, and being physical. However, we would hope that there would be more specific language about connecting children to nature and what that looks like, not just playing in the outdoors.</p>	RFP	
<p>I have two questions, the statement was made in the presentation that DCYF tends to develop better ways to fund agencies that offer a continuum of services. What do you mean? It's a little unclear how this will reflect in the RFP and I think there is a lot of tension considering the decrease in prescription from DCYF, which again is a great thing, but what does that mean for agencies that might identify themselves as OST but also work with TAY and also might do some mentoring? Does that mean multiple funding streams that they have to apply for? Do we submit a proposal and we get told that our funding is going to come from multiple funding streams?</p>	RFP	
<p>I have a question regarding Economic and Workforce development. I was wondering if any of that money is ear marked for innovative strategies like social entrepreneurship for youth instead of retail careers? How are we thinking outside of the box in this area? Also for TAY systems of care, money going toward mental health, is there opportunity to fund alternatives? In order for us to really heal communities we are working with we need to think outside of the box. Lastly, for Family Empowerment is there anything addressing healing trauma for families and what that is going to look like?</p>	RFP	
<p>We are very excited with the direction of the new Services Allocation Plan draft to support those who are in most need of support and services. We firmly believe that this in addition to many indicators of success that DCYF is examining, it should also track the percentage of how many staff and volunteers are former participants from San Francisco communities and that they place value in funding organizations that utilize this staffing strategy. Our agency hopes that the SAP funds the individualized supports needed for high need students during the OST hours in all programs throughout the city and that these funds are available whenever and wherever the need presents itself to reflect special and high needs populations that access the OST programs.</p>	RFP	

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>I had a couple of comments and a question with regard to the categories that cross the age continuum. Many of us provide interventions that are divided by age within a particular category. How might you make decisions if we have emotional wellness groups for each age group i.e. TAY, Teen, and Middle school students? I know people have made comments about the importance of recognizing wraparound services as a way of being able to deepen our relationship with youth. It has been a benefit that has been hard to quantify. I might encourage you to consider a category that includes one or more categories together as a way of including the wraparound concept. Lastly, if we offer programs for multiple age groups within a given category, how will you make decisions based on equity across each age group, across the priority populations, or other dollar considerations for the different funding sources?</p>	RFP	
<p>I am hoping that DCYF will consider taking a broader two-generation approach that focuses on creating opportunities for and addressing needs of both vulnerable children and parents together. Research has shown that the effectiveness of two-generation approaches. The Services Allocation Plan has essential components of this; however, it would be helpful to see this approach clearly being funded in the RFP.</p>	RFP	
<p>Will the page count or character count be increased if an organization is applying under multiple categories?</p>	RFP	
<p>Is there an average grant size? Is there a maximum percentage of the program budget we can apply for? For example: if the program budget is \$600,000-can you ask for ½ or \$300,000 or is it a smaller/larger percentage?</p>	RFP	
<p>Will letters of support be needed or allowed to be turned in to make the proposal stronger?</p>	RFP	
<p>From time of RFP release, when will it be due? How much time do we have to do our proposals?</p>	RFP	
<p>1) Summer contracts have been distinct for OST as hours of service, programming and youth served are often widely different from school-year OST - how is this being thought through? 2) How is dosage being considered? More like OST where it is average daily attendance for programs OR more like specialized teen where it is dosage along a spectrum of annual hours in programming?</p>	RFP	
<p>1. This was brought up at yesterday's presentation, but I would appreciate more clarity about the anticipated revised format for the RFPs. As a provider of comprehensive services, many of our programs interweave and work together to amplify each other's effectiveness. In the past, we submitted several applications - almost as many as there are service areas. In addition to some inevitable redundancy, it's sometimes difficult to talk about the synergistic effectiveness of the programs. Can you provide some clarity about how we can better address this? Will we still need to write an application for each service area or will there be a way to consolidate our requests for funding for different service area into one (or at least fewer) proposals? 2. This question is about the funding streams and which entity manages the RFPs and applications. For example, all Early Care and Education is distributed through the interdepartmental partnerships; those allocation decisions are made by First 5 from the proposals we submitted to them in February, right? Or, in the Emotional Well-Being service area, DPH's Behavioral Health Services administer and allocate the funding from their currently active RFP 1-2017, correct? If not, could you tell us how the allocation of funds from interdepartmental partnerships is decided? 3. In a similar vein, can you explain how the EXCEL match works with the proposed Out of School Time allocations?</p>	RFP & Appendix D	

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>Many youth participants actually live in other areas, then where our program is based. They may have been displaced. The effect of this movement is that one may see lower number or concentrations of youth below the poverty rate living in a specific neighborhood, but with strong ties to other neighborhoods. Housing instability is mentioned on p. 7. We hope this nuance is not lost through the RFP process.</p> <p>p. 14</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Informal probation is used increasingly. However this means programs that require formal probation are not able to serve them. This may be an opportunity for DCYF to revise these limitations. -We only accept youth that have been in the system within the last 3 months. Again, this may be an opportunity for DCYF to revise these limitations. -Other branches of the justice system are not mentioned, including wards of court or foster care. -Other sources of qualified referrals are not mentioned such as Occupational Therapy and Training Program -Mental health services are also needed -Staff appreciates that case management is included in the description of necessary services. In other programs we see the value of wrap-around services and family engagement. In our Employment services, that work is absorbed into other workers' jobs and focuses on the individual. We hope that there will be consideration for formal inclusion of case management in our current work. 	RFP	
<p>This is feedback on behalf of Service Provider Working Group meeting (March 9), Youth Workforce Section.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Excited to see included: Career focused, not just job focused; includes MYEEP, youthworks, and partnership with HSA; youth development framework as required; names TAY as a populations; context setting at start of this section. -What's missing: financial literacy; industry sector driven approach to youth workforce; trauma informed care; weak if any explicit intersection between youth workforce and education supports; no mention undocumented youth who face exceptional challenges securing paid employment; more specificity about SFUSD partnerships -Left wondering: How much of a priority are 6 - 13 year olds? How/what type of youth workforce strategies are envisioned for this pre-working age group? 	RFP	
<p>Are instructions forthcoming re: how to apply in more than one service area - for direct grant support? For example, my organization's most logical submission will be in the OUT OF SCHOOL TIME service area, although we have capacity to and are interested in providing services in either or all of the following areas: EDUCATIONAL SUPPORTS; ENRICHMENT, LEADERSHIP & SKILL BUILDING; and/or EMOTIONAL WELL-BEING.</p>	RFP	
<p>We're delighted foster youth have been identified as a priority population. We hope the SAP and resulting RFP will acknowledge that 60-65% of San Francisco's foster youth are placed outside the county on any given day, requiring San Francisco organizations to identify and facilitate programs that are often 100 miles away in order to serve them appropriately. We cannot rely only on SF-based direct service programs to serve foster youth. Wherever they are placed, foster youth remain San Francisco's responsibility and should be considered San Francisco residents. In anticipation of the RFP process, I would like to ask for a review of the reader scoring system. Many similar systems will 'toss out' outlier scores that are much higher or lower than the norm, as a quality control. There are also other ways to review readers and their scores that could be considered to maintain quality and consistency. These systems can also allow for feedback for the readers who are scoring inconsistently or outside the norm.</p>	RFP	

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>In addition to the Service Areas identified in the draft SAP, you will consider including access to nature as a critically important element of the services and opportunities offered to our city's families through DCYF funded programs.</p>	RFP	
<p>We encourage DCYF to consider funding opportunities for organizations supporting hard-to-reach youth by partnering with OneDegree to facilitate awareness of and linkages to critical services.</p>	RFP	
<p>The CNA sites the need for “social cohesion” and “better motional and social support in the classroom,” but does not explicitly mention the importance of arts education. The arts have been proven to build social-emotional skills and improve self-confidence, which can play a large role in one’s emotional and mental health. Overall, the need for the arts, creativity in the classroom, and/or non-traditional programming should be mentioned more explicitly in the RFP.</p> <p>We also have these questions/concerns about the specific strategies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. OST: We appreciate that the OST strategy focuses on social skills and creativity. What is the distinction between OST programs and in-school programming; if DCYF values social skills and creativity in OST programs, why aren’t those same areas addressed in-school? We are concerned that arts education is valued in after-school programming but is overlooked as an in-school program. 2. Educational Supports: Does this strategy intend to include the arts as a method of encouraging education achievement? 3. Enrichment, Leadership, and Skill Building: Although not stated explicitly, this strategy seems to be the best fit for arts programming. Do the skills referenced in this area include social-emotional skills? Do curriculum-based activities include arts? The strategy includes programming that takes place “in summer and afterschool, or as a standalone” but does it also include in-school programming? 	RFP	
<p>I love the clarity of the plan, and the intentionality of matching resource allocation to outcomes along a continuum. That being said, I encourage the department to maintain this approach when it rolls out the requests for proposal. For example the Beacon initiative funding is only available to those providers that have been selected by a particular school, not necessarily those schools who need it the most or could be most effective. Similarly, the MYEEP program is a completely closed system and participation is by invitation only. If we are building a service delivery system that is accountable to our vision as a City, our processes should reflect that as well.</p>	RFP	
<p>Service Provider Working Group “ Small Group re: Justice Service Area</p> <p>-What are we excited to see discussed in the SAP for the specific service area? That DCYF is trying to measure their own impact.</p> <p>-What is missing that should be highlighted in the SAP for the specific service area? *Prevention/Secondary Prevention; *No space for High Risk Youth/TAY; *Excessively truant youth?</p>	RFP	
<p>Would like DCYF to consider including language which prioritizes replicating and/or expanding successful program models which have potential to be taken to additional scale. While innovation and new program concepts are important, there are many programs with proven track records that can benefit a lot more youth if offered at additional school sites or neighborhoods.</p>	RFP	

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>My purpose is to submit information to be used in the writing of the Request for Proposal scheduled for July, 2017. I am a Native SF whose family moved into San Francisco in the late 1930s. I have served the youth of San Francisco since before the first 20 years of the Children's Fund, but with absolutely no direct funding from DCYF. I am offering this contribution to the request for proposal in this, the first competitive grantwriting opportunity in this next 25 year follow up to the original children's fund which I applauded at the outset but did not see appropriately impact the most vulnerable San Francisco children, including my son, nephews and many other children from San Francisco low-income communities. When the Children's fund was enacted in 1991, my eldest son was 5 years old. I was happy that this support was happening. But my son and several of his friends and cousins and others in his peer group died before they were 25, the age of Transition-aged youth. This showed me that the Children's fund was not reaching ALL children in San Francisco. I did many years of youth advocacy and programs but all using my own very-limited financial resources, although I took children all over the nation, and coached every year since 1990, after graduating from San Francisco State University, but I never received any direct funds from the Children's fund to assist in my effort to lift children from SF's most vulnerable communities. My recommendation is that the upcoming Request for Proposal is written to include an opportunity to create a CITYWIDE early intervention for violence and academic disparities in our City. Before San Franciscan citizen children leave elementary school, they ALL should receive the OPPORTUNITY for an assessment and treatment of their capacity TO PHYSICALLY ENGAGE OTHERS CHILDREN in a safe, fair, civil way. This is to reduce the prevalence of unsafe, unfair, uncivil physical engagement in San Francisco society and the world by giving children a template to do this positively and effectively. All students should have an opportunity to meet their match in a citywide wrestling organization. Most people will immediately discount this recommendation as a sport or athletic solution, but I am talking about an ancient human violence prevention tool and cultural and educational program inherent in all indigenous and non-indigenous societies, alike. When I say ALL elementary students should have this opportunity, I specifically mean any child that goes to 1) public school, 2) private school, 3) rec and park, 4) public housing complex, or 5) community-based organization receiving DCYF support. A pilot to this CITYWIDE violence and academic intervention proposal is currently being employed at Malcolm X Academy, San Francisco's lowest performing elementary school, according to test data, as a pilot that has been in development since 1990, without direct support from DCYF. This program is Scholar Wrestling's STEM Program which cancels out physical conflicts among students in order to free the student's mental and physical resources available for science, technology, education, math, language and arts. Thank you for your advocacy and may you all write the best and most effective request for proposals in human history.</p>	RFP	
<p>We all really appreciated the neighborhood and the other identification breakdown in your report, but we were a little disappointed in lack of gender programming across all the pathways. We work with girls who are primarily from low-income backgrounds and neighborhoods as you have identified. However, we work across workforce development, afterschool, and civic engagement. We were also concerned that there were no focus on the investment in the community and sustainability of these programs for the people, girls, and the youth that we are serving. We are wondering what the emphasis is going to be in the RFP and also wanted to echo the remarks about how to apply across these pathways.</p>	RFP	

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>Overall, I think it's a thoughtful and nicely designed document. I appreciate your use of the OCOF framework. I am currently working on the OCOF working group on "Coordinated Services & Targeted Resources" and am confident that "nature" will become a more integrated and incorporated element in a number of its outcomes. Please note that the OCOF specifically references the San Francisco Children's Outdoor Bill of Rights as a potential metric (capitalizing on its endorsement by many stakeholder city agencies and non-profits). Here is the text from BOS resolution as some of the language might be referenced in your RFP: (Included The San Francisco Children's Outdoor Bill of Rights)</p>	RFP	
<p>Please incorporate nature experience and nature connection opportunities for programs that serve family, children and youth in San Francisco. These opportunities are vital to children's physical, mental and emotional health. Nature connection programs can utilize the many natural/naturalistic areas in San Francisco that can be found in the neighborhoods and communities in which SF children reside and attend school. Please integrate the SF Children's Outdoor Bill of Rights fully into the SAP. Thank you.</p>	RFP	
<p>Feedback from Service Provider Working Group Small Group re: OST Service Area Question: Does a comprehensive OST program submit an RFP across service areas? Or will they need to submit multiple RFPs? -What are you excited to see discussed in the SAP for OST? a. Calling out the need to support OSTs with resources & training to better support youth with special needs b. Cultural competency for programs/staff c. Socio-emotional learning is a priority d. Low-income youth in private schools e. "Explore the world" without enrichment – can this be through new partnerships with "Enrichment, Leadership & Skill Building?" f. Work with SFUSD – does this include the ExCel matching funds? -What is missing that should be highlighted in the SAP for the specific service area? a. Nothing specific re: access to nature b. Nutrition and food c. Clarity re: overlap of service areas (i.e. education, enrichment, OST, etc) d. What amount has already been earmarked? -What seems in the SAP related to the specific service area is in conflict with what you understand to be true based on your daily work? a. Living wage for staff b. Alignment of expectations between SFUSD/ExCel</p>	RFP	
<p>I have a couple of questions regarding the allocation for mental health. It was a predominant need in the Community Needs Assessment(CNA), but only \$2.6 million dollars is being allocated for ages 0-24. I wanted to know if I could have a bit more rationale behind this allocation for mental health. Another question I have in regards to middle school in looking at a whole continuum 6-13 years old. I know at my organization we serve kids we break them up into elementary school, middle school, and high school. So looking at the continuum being 6-13 years old how are we measuring for middle school population? What are the parameters for success?</p>	Mental Health	

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>DCYF's Youth Advisory Board stated the following: In Emotional Well-Being, is mental health part of the emotional well-being for ages 0-5 and is that addressed in the Early Care and Education Service Area?</p>	Mental Health	
<p>Most of my questions boil down to the mental health piece, we are hearing from all of our sites that mental health is a key need and we are not able to provide it given the general resources. It looks like a lot of the funding for mental health is already ear marked for existing programs, like health and wellness centers. Will there be space under OST to request mental health services under those funding streams, as well as is there any coordination between DCYF and other agencies that do fund mental health in youth programs so that can be alluded to in the RFP that there are going to be opportunities for mental health services? Where else can we find resources for mental health because that is what we are hearing mostly from our schools?</p>	Mental Health	
<p>I am here to ask a high-level question. It is well proven that impact of early education on vulnerable children and we know that there are tremendous needs. We have an early care workforce that is in crisis. We have families who are on a waiting list for childcare subsidies. I think the department has done a wonderful job considering the range of needs in the city, but I think at the very high level is one of the questions of whether there is enough being invested of the Children and youth fund that is going to in Early Care and Education. I think sometimes it is easy to solve the problems where there are smaller amounts of money that is needed to solve a problem. While in Early Care and Education the amount that is actually needed is in the tens of millions dollars to actually provide quality care and education for all. I believe one other thing that I was going to say is that there is still a high percentage of children in San Francisco who are not ready for kindergarten. I have a concern whether enough is being invested in Early Care and Education.</p>	ECE	
<p>I just want to make sure that in this process that Early Care and Education includes also funding to ensure work place conditions for parents and making sure there is equity in the starting line for all children. So that parents have equal access at their job to taking time off for pregnancy and afterwards for bonding. At our agency one of our focal points and we've worked very hard particularly out in San Francisco for this past year making sure that there is full paid leave for new parents for bonding, but that still doesn't give them the right to take time off. We know that low income and minorities are disproportionately affected by these policies, so I would like to make sure that funding is going to ensure that this will improve opportunities for all children and their parents. We know that improving the work place opportunities for parents also improves children's health and you have an opportunity to really ensure that you promote early childhood brain development and that carries on throughout their life.</p>	ECE	<p>Funding for Early Care and Education is work ordered to the Office of Early Care & Education. OECE, in partnership with its Citizens Advisory Committee, determines how to allocate ECE fundings.</p>
<p>San Francisco has done a good job providing resources for early care and education services for four year olds. However, there is a great unmet need for early care and education services for infants and toddlers. If the increased funding was intended to fill the gap of unmet need for early care and education, there needs to be a much greater increase in investment of at least \$10 million to begin to address that need. Thank you.</p>	ECE	

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>The SAP indicates that 38% of SFUSD students did not demonstrate the readiness skills to be academically successful by 3rd grade. At the same time, there remains a wait list for quality subsidized child care of over 3700 young children in SF eligible for early education. While receiving only 18% of the total program funds, children 0-5 make up 41% of the population of children 0-18.</p> <p>Early intervention through quality early childhood education is a proven way to give children the advantages they need to succeed. Especially given the focus on equity and access, this uneven allocation of resources to our youngest, most vulnerable children in San Francisco must be altered to reflect the values stated in this SAP. In addition, the lack of access to quality child care exacerbates the devastating cycle of chronic poverty by denying opportunity for low income parents to pursue education, training and job search activities that can support the path to economic self sufficiency and family stability.</p>	ECE	
<p>p.22 -There is a sense that the 16 key indicators focus heavily on School-based data. This may obscure the needs of TAY. -Similarly, the statistics focus on citywide populations. This may obscure the severity of certain problems within neighborhoods or specific demographic groups. It would be useful to share data by neighborhoods or demographic, for example for indicator 1 which is at 2% but may be highly concentrated within neighborhoods or demographics that experience higher incarceration rates. We suggest the same for indicator 3 when the data is made available.</p> <p>p. 24 -Finally, for indicator 16, staff would find it useful to have disaggregated data (enrolled in school, working, or both).</p>	Misc.	DCYF will release more details on the Population Indicators in June that will show the indicators disaggregated by race/ethnicity, age and other demographics where available.
<p>The other question is in the results statements there is a lot of wonderful language, and I am wondering if there is anything that can be said about citizenship and civics?</p>	Misc.	We will not be editing the Result statements; however, we consider them broad enough to allow for programming focused on promoting civic engagement.

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>Service Provider Working Group stated the following: We had a meeting on Thursday with about 35 service providers present and solicited system wide feedback. The first question is please explain any key shifts by priority in each service area including the creation of new service areas. How those decisions were made and why?</p>	Misc.	<p>Input received during the CNA process and a Results Based Accountability framework were used to develop the Service Areas in the SAP. The biggest changes since the last RFP are the inclusion of TAY and the focus on equity.</p>
<p>The Service Provider Working Group stated the following: TAY services are now a part of service areas will younger youth, is there a commitment to supporting TAY services that they will not fall below a certain percentage of the total allocations and if so, what would that be?</p>	Misc.	<p>We did not develop minimum or maximum allocations by age group. DCYF will make every effort to allocate funding equitably across all age groups.</p>
<p>The Service Provider Working Group stated the following: What type of data management and evaluation changes can be expected in the new cycle because I know that has been discussed and how is DCYF thinking about federal funding in relationship to the SAP, allocation ranges, and the RFP?</p>	Misc.	<p>Evaluation is discussed on page 20 of the SAP. The City is monitoring potential impacts to federal funding. If there are shifts at the federal level that significantly impact funding, the SAP can be modified with Board approval.</p>

Public Feedback for SAP	Response Category	Additional response
<p>Will there be funding for capacity building in terms of support for staff development(funding for non DCYF based workshops and professional development)?</p> <p>And for salaries to help staff deal with the high expense of working and living in San Francisco-even creative uses like helping for subsidized transportation. Too many staff are moving away and can't afford to live or work in San Francisco.</p>	Misc.	These are expenses that programs should build into their budgets when they submit proposals.
<p>Will we have another get together like this to ask questions or will we use email?</p>	Misc.	The public will have an opportunity to provide additional feedback on the SAP at the OAC meeting on 4/17.
<p>Service Provider Working Group stated the following: Does DCYF plan on providing any technical assistance to support equity within the RFP process, to support smaller community based organizations so that they can respond competitively especially around RBA?</p>	Misc.	DCYF will provide additional RBA trainings at the end of May.