

Our Children, Our Families Council
Outcomes Working Group
Summary of Feedback on Draft Outcomes and Indicators
October 22, 2015

DRAFT OUTCOMES

Areas of General Agreement

The table below lists the outcomes with the most general support from working group members who provided their feedback by 10/22/15. The middle column highlights a summary of suggested minor changes, and the last column reflects proposed revised language for consideration.

| Draft Outcome Presented to Council on Sept 10 | Summary of Suggested Changes in Bold | Proposed Revised Outcome for Consideration <small>(Note: Bold identifies changes from Sept 10 version)</small> |
|--|---|---|
| A. School success is a reality for all children and youth | All children and youth are successful in school; or All students graduate from high school | All children and youth are successful in school |
| B. Youth succeed in post-secondary paths and careers | All youth succeed in post-secondary and careers paths such that they are self sufficient | All youth succeed in post-secondary and careers paths so that they can be self-sufficient |
| C. Children and youth are physically and emotionally healthy | Children and youth are healthy – physically, emotionally and mentally | Children and youth are physically and emotionally healthy |
| D. All families are economically secure | All families are economically stable, meet self-sufficiency standards, and are financially resilient ; or All families have basic resources needed to support themselves | All families are economically secure |
| E. All families have a safe and nurturing environment for their children | All families provide a safe and nurturing environment for their children; or All families live in safe settings | All families provide a safe and nurturing environment for their children |

Areas of Divergence

The table below lists the outcome from the Sept 10 draft with the least amount of support and suggestions for new outcomes from working group members who provided their feedback by 10/22/15. The second column includes a summary of comments and concerns.

| Draft Outcome | Concerns/Comments |
|--|---|
| From Sept 10 Options: F. All children, youth and families aim to thrive | -Somewhat repetitive of the other outcomes -Human survival instincts are to thrive -Perhaps frame more like Nashville example: “experiencing social equity in terms of access to opportunities, resources and information that are critical to their success” |
| NEW #1: All SF children ages 0 to 5 have a strong start; or All SF children ages 0 to 5 have what they need to support their development | -Evidence that there are multiple factors that relate to Kindergarten readiness beyond participation in early care and education programs -Do we want an outcome to be age specific if others are not? |
| NEW #2: Youth ages 18 to 24 who are out of school and unemployed are connected to education, housing and social services | -Is this more of a process metric than an outcome? -Do we want an outcome to be age specific if others are not? |

DRAFT INDICATORS

Areas of General Agreement

The table below lists the indicators with the most general support from working group members who provided their feedback by 10/22/15. The middle column highlights a summary of suggested minor changes, and the last column reflects proposed revised language for consideration.

| Draft Indicator Presented to Council on Sept 10 | Summary of Comments, Concerns and Suggestions | Proposed Revised Indicator for Consideration <small>(Note: Bold identifies changes from Sept 10 version)</small> |
|---|--|---|
| 1) % of children (ages 0-5) enrolled in high-quality early care and education settings | -SF may shift its definition of “high-quality” in the near future -Limitation is data only available currently for publicly-funded settings -This can be viewed as both a process metric and an indicator of success | % of children (ages 0-5) enrolled in high-quality early care and education settings |
| 2) % of SFUSD students ready for Kindergarten | -SFUSD currently only tracks this for the subset of children who attend SFUSD preschools -Needs to be population-level | % of SFUSD Kindergarteners ready for Kindergarten |
| 3) % K-12 SFUSD students attending school regularly | -Would be ideal to capture for all students, beyond those in SFUSD | % K-12 SFUSD students attending school regularly |
| 4) % of SFUSD students (gr 3-8 and 11) proficient or above in English Language Arts and Math in elementary and middle schools | -Would be ideal to capture for all students, beyond those in SFUSD | % of SFUSD students (gr 3-8 and 11) proficient or above in English Language Arts and Math in elementary and middle schools |
| 5) % of SFUSD 12th graders graduating UC/CSU eligible | | % of SFUSD 12th graders graduating high school <small>(Note: SFUSD requires students to meet UC/CSU eligibility requirements to graduate, so this is a proposed change in language only, not in how it would be measured.)</small> |
| 7) % of youth ages 18-24 enrolled in school or work | | % of youth ages 18-24 enrolled in school or work |
| 11) % of families with children who meet the Self-Sufficiency Standard | -Some concern that OCOF partners may not be able to influence this indicator, although City oversees cash and in-kind benefits -Perhaps consider using the federal poverty line | % of families with children who meet the Self-Sufficiency Standard |
| 13) % of mothers receiving prenatal care in the first trimester | | % of mothers receiving prenatal care in the first trimester |
| 15) % of families who report feeling safe in their neighborhoods | - Consider adding language about perception of safety while traveling around the city, although that may be combining two separate issues -Consider crime rates as an alternative, although research indicates perception impacts quality of life | % of families who report feeling safe in their neighborhoods |

Areas of Divergence

The table below lists the outcome from the Sept 10 draft with the least amount of support and suggestions for new outcomes from working group members who provided their feedback by 10/22/15. The second column includes a summary of comments and concerns.

| Draft Indicator | Concerns/Comments |
|---|--|
| From Sept 10 Options: 6) % of all SFUSD college attendees who complete a degree within six years | -Concerns about whether six years is too long or too short of a time frame -Should include credential/certificates in addition to degrees |
| From Sept 10 Options: 8) % of SFUSD students (gr 5, 7 and 9) who have a healthy body composition | -Would be ideal to capture for all youth, beyond those in SFUSD -Would be ideal to capture for younger youth – that data not available via SFUSD |
| From Sept 10 Options: 9) % of children (ages 2-11) who visited the dentist within the last six months | -Consider using a different measure of wellness, such as asthma or injury, although dental health applies to a much broader segment of the population |
| From Sept 10 Options: 10) % of SFUSD students (gr 5-12) who feel close to people at school | -Would be ideal to capture for all youth, beyond those in SFUSD |
| From Sept 10 Options: 12) Rates of children experiencing child maltreatment | |
| From Sept 10 Options: 14) % of stably housed families and young adults | -Consider using HUD definition of “severe housing problems” which includes at least one of the following four: a) Lacks complete kitchen facilities, b) Lacks complete plumbing facilities, c) More than 1.5 persons per room, d) Cost Burden over 50% |
| From Sept 10 Options: 16) # of youth impacted by the juvenile justice system | -Consider expanding from just youth referred to Juvenile Probation to also include children with a parent/caregiver currently in SF County Jail or being supervised by Adult Probation |
| From Sept 10 Options: 17) % of families and % of children ages 0 to 24 who choose to participate in services and programs that foster their development | -Consider framing around % who engage or opt into a finite list of publicly funded services/programs |
| NEW #18: % of children born at a healthy birth weight | -Public health expert suggested that prenatal care was a better indicator than birth weight because a) prenatal care is one of the best predictors for children born at a healthy birth weight; and b) one of the most effective strategies to improve the % of children born at a healthy birth weight would focus on prenatal care |
| NEW #19: % of children at benchmarks of developmental screening | |
| NEW #20: Average number of words spoken in households of children ages 0 to 3 | |

New Suggested Process/Contributing Metrics

The table below lists suggestions for new suggested metrics that appear to be most suitable as a “process” or “contributing” metric. All suggestions are from working group members who provided their feedback by 10/22/15.

| New Suggested Process/Contributing Metrics |
|--|
| a) % of SFUSD students who participate in summer enrichment activities |
| b) % of families with children that regularly access libraries, parks and other cultural institutions |
| c) % of SF playground meeting quality and cleanliness expectations |
| d) Rates of maternal depression |
| e) % of children and youth regularly having wellness medical visits |
| f) % of children and youth with mental health needs receiving treatment |
| g) % of children and youth with special needs receiving services |
| h) % of children and youth in foster care or the juvenile justice system receiving services |
| i) % of youth ages 18-24 lacking adequate housing |
| j) % of families receiving all forms of economic support for which they are eligible (such as food stamps, welfare, Earned Income Tax Credit programs) |
| k) % of families with bank accounts or participating in the Kindergarten to College savings account program for all incoming K’s in SFUSD |
| l) % of unemployed parents receiving job training |
| m) % of children and youth experiencing exposure to domestic violence |
| n) Annual violent injury rate |