



Our Children, Our Families Council



Vision Statement:

San Francisco disrupts the historical and institutional disparities enabled by policy and resource decisions that prevent children, youth, and families of all races, incomes, nativity, genders, and neighborhoods from thriving.

Outcomes Framework Working Group Draft Meeting Notes

October 29, 2015

4:00 p.m.

DCYF, 1390 Market St, Suite 900, Mint Conference Room

Meeting Objectives:

- Discuss possible new conceptual approach to outcomes framework
- Consider areas of general agreement of feedback and discuss areas of divergence of feedback for both draft outcomes and indicators for consideration

Attendees: Co-Chairs Dan Kelly & Natasha Hoehn; Curtis Chan, Brian Cheu, Thu Cung, Landon Dickey, September Jarrett, Michelle Jeffers (for Michael Lambert), Jan Link (for Ritu Khanna), Masharika Maddison, Laura Moye, Michele Rutherford, Luisa Sicairos, Abby Snay, Maria Luz Torre, Michael Wald, Wei-Min Wang

Not Present: Sherilyn Adams, Ritu Khanna, Michelle Kirian, Michael Lambert, Laura Tam, Ciara Wade, Jillian Wu

Council Staff in Attendance: Sandra Naughton, Laurie Scolari, Jennifer Tran

- **Call to Order**
- **Roll Call**
- **Meeting Objectives and Agenda Review (discussion only)**
Natasha Hoehn provided an overview of the meeting objectives and the meeting agenda, in addition to reminding the group about the meeting norms they suggested at the first meeting.

Sandra Naughton provided a quick reminder of the working group's objective, which is to provide guidance on development of outcomes framework, including the community engagement process to inform that development. She reviewed the working group's timeline and the goal of informing the development of a framework that will be presented to the Council for action at its January 28 meeting. She reviewed the guiding parameters that were established by the Mayor and Superintendent's Offices for the development of the framework, which are: asset-based; population level; focused on end goals (milestones we want all children, youth, and families to reach); and fewer is better. She also reviewed the six criteria that were developed to guide the Council in selecting outcomes and indicators: equity-focused, understandable, meaningful, influence-able, measurable, and research-informed. A draft set of outcomes and indicators were developed by consulting national research on such frameworks, examining local frameworks and outcomes data, reviewing the literature base, and interviews with local content experts from different discipline. These were shared as draft options at the September 10th Council meeting. This

working group was created to provide further input on the development of the framework and to provide input on the community and stakeholder engagement process to inform the development of the framework.

- **Discuss Possible Shift in Conceptual Approach to Our Children, Our Families Outcomes Framework (discussion only)**

Sandra Naughton shared a newly proposed conceptual shift for the outcomes framework, which was based feedback from the working group’s first meeting. Rather than listing one outcome with several indicators linked to it, staff proposed considering the outcomes as a group of interconnected goals, and rather than having indicators tied to specific outcomes, the indicators would be listed as milestones generally in order that corresponds to the age and developmental spectrum from ages 0 to 24. Indicators related to families would be listed below and spanning age/developmental spectrum. In addition, the idea of replacing the word “outcomes” with “goals” and “indicators” with “measures of success” was introduced. (See meeting materials posted on the OCOF website to view the draft visual of this new proposed approach.)

Participants were asked to discuss what they liked and disliked about this new proposed approach in pairs and then report back to the large group. Below is a summary of the large group report out:

What Works
Graphic helps convey understanding
For stakeholders that work by age, easier to see how they fit into the framework
Interconnectedness component
Developmental progression is clear
Language is relatively clear, so can be easily translated
Makes it easier for indicators to measure multiple goals – not a one to one relationship. Indicators can be applicable to multiple goals.
Moving away from the one-to-one relationship broadens the applicability of indicators. Includes the family in the bigger picture as foundational.
Brings us out of our silos. Visual that helps us think about collective impact.

Areas for Improvement
What is the overriding purpose? As a city, we could meet these goals and have measures of success, but how does it show positive social transformation as the ultimate goal?
Graphic is overwhelming. Need to make it visually more appealing. Staff noted that a graphic designer will be used in the final iteration of the framework.
Family indicators don’t fit into chronological framework; feels disconnected from children and youth indicators.
While measures look foundational to the goals, the crosswalk isn’t clear. Need to show how measures support the goals – perhaps in another document and not in this visual representation. Also, need to be clear about what components are foundational.
Gear interconnection and flow should be considered.
Symbolism of gears may bring up connotations we want to avoid (i.e. old economy/industrial age).
I believe things are linear and that certain conditions lay a foundation for other developments to occur, such as living in a safe environment, access to prenatal care, birthweight, etc which are foundational for future indicators/milestones to be reached.
History of SF is to set outcomes at high levels that everyone agrees to but that are not specific enough to lead to a clear plan of action or accountability. We need to create something concrete enough to get buy-in but also to be actionable.
Concern that if we don’t assign different measures to goals, that the goals become diluted.
Where does this framework comes from? Public Health borrows from established frameworks. Concern

that this approach may be combining two different theories. It looks like there may be both a causal framework and a lifecourse framework at work here – we may need to decide on just one. Perhaps draw from national/international frameworks? The foundational pieces are the largest force and the most difficult thing to move.

Suggest that we want to be able to see strong children, strong families, and healthy communities in this, but it seems like we are missing some of the community part which is the context in which families live.

- **Discuss Draft Outcomes for Consideration for the Our Children, Our Families Council (discussion only)**
 Natasha Hoehn explained that the group was going to engage in a small group discussions around the proposed revised outcomes. Each person was asked to look at the 5 proposed revised outcomes as a group and to decide how they would rate their level of agreement with them using a “Gradients of Agreement” scale from 1 to 8, with 8 as the highest level of agreement and 1 as the lowest. Each person was asked to identify what they would want changed to increase their level of agreement.

Below are the revised proposed outcomes the groups were asked to discuss:

Proposed Revised Outcome for Consideration (Note: Bold identifies changes from Sept 10 version)
A. All children and youth are successful in school
B. 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
D. All families are economically secure
E. All families provide a safe and nurturing environment for their children

Below are the notes from each of the four small group discussions:

Group #1

Rating: consensus of 3 from all participants

Concerns:

- For A, use language in Sept 10 version of the outcome
- For B, use language in Sept 10 version of the outcome
- For C, add mentally
- For E, use language in Sept 10 version of the outcome

Group #2:

Ratings: 3,3,3,3

Concerns:

- For A, use education instead of school
- For B, success in careers is hard to measure/quantify
- For C, add “all” language
- For D, is this outcome achievable/realistic? How do we call out the cost of living?
- For E, the “provide” language is problematic. Broaden/responsibility on families solely? Phrasing puts onus on families

Group #3:

Ratings: 2,2,3,3

Concerns:

- Maybe add an additional outcome with explicit focus on equity (families feeling respected, included, valued, part of the city’s social fabric, etc.)

- Want to see TAY (not young adults) called out in the outcome statements
- Want to see consistency in “all” language in each outcome
- Maybe be more specific about populations of concern (age, race, ability, etc)
- For B, is “self sufficiency” realistic? Or aspirational enough?

Group #4:

Ratings: 3 to 6

Concerns:

- For B, consider adding self-actualize in addition to post-secondary success
 - For C, consider adding “mentally” healthy
 - For all of them, make clear that the city, district, and community have a role in making sure the outcomes are met; “owns” the outcomes
 - Look at them all from a disparity lens
- **Discuss Draft Indicators for Consideration for the Our Children, Our Families Council (discussion only)**
Dan Kelly provided a brief overview of the purpose of indicators or measures of success. He shared that the group was going to focus its attention for the remainder of the meeting on the indicators for which there seemed to be the least amount of agreement from the group, based on the completed feedback forms submitted to OCOF staff. He then asked participants to raise their hands to indicate interest in the two indicators they were most interested in discussing.

Below is a summary of the discussion of the three indicators that most members of the group were interested in discussing:

#14: % of stably housed families and young adults

- From the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development (MOHCD), extreme housing burden (50% of income devoted to housing costs) is a better measure in SF than the national standard of 30%, just given our high cost of living. This data would be available from the Census, but would necessitate a multi-year sample to estimate disaggregated data by race/ethnicity.
- MOHCD had suggested to OCOF staff that another measure to use would be % of families with what HUD defines as “Severe housing problems,” but after some exploration it does not seem feasible to disaggregate that data for families with children specifically (it is available by households generally). MOHCD suggested perhaps using data about families in SROs in the current proposed measure, but it appears that such data is not current or reliable.
- The current proposed measure includes the homeless count conducted by the Human Services Agency every two years and overcrowding data available through the Census. It includes foster youth who are considered stably housed in foster homes. It includes families in shelters and undocumented parents with children who are US citizens.
- It was suggested to consider adding a measure related to families living in concentrated poverty.
- SFUSD noted they have data on unaccompanied minors

#6: % of all SFUSD college attendees who complete a degree within six years

- OCOF has contacted SFUSD about trying to include certificates in the data they extract from the National Clearinghouse. There was discussion of trying to leverage efforts by the state community college chancellor’s office to try to track progress in community colleges.
- There was discussion about the lag effect of this indicator – it measures post-secondary completion of students who graduated SFUSD six years prior.
- It was suggested to also track the SFUSD graduates who do not go one to college. Who are they and why don’t they go to college within two years of graduating?

#8: % of SFUSD students (gr 5, 7 and 9) who have a healthy body composition

- The measure is drawn from a statewide assessment administered by California Dept of Education and a lot of resources are deployed at the local level to implement it. Some participants wondered why only grades 5, 7 and 9 had data, and interest in obesity rates for ages 0 to 5, TAY and those not in SFUSD. Those are the only grades that SFUSD assesses. Some data on obesity rates for children in Preschool for All exists.
 - It was suggested to also explore physical fitness, since there are large disparities between race/ethnicity in SF. People of color are at a disadvantage because they live in overcrowded conditions, schools that don't have PE programs, and can't afford to participate in some fitness programs. It was noted that foster youth and youth with disabilities face challenges in engaging in physical activity.
 - The discussion moved to questions about children/youth's access to regular primary care and screenings. It was shared that access to primary care of children is generally good, but drops off for middle age and adolescent children. It was also mentioned that dental caries – especially at the Kindergarten level – are a large focus given the disparities that have been documented. Denti-Cal providers are limited in the city.
 - The group also discussed the gap between access to care and utilization of care.
-
- **Announcements (discussion only)**
 - Next steps: Staff will send out notes and a revised proposal for the framework by Nov 17.
 - “Share Your Voice” fall community meetings sponsored by OCOF, DCYF and Office of Early Care and Education. Please consider attending and help spread the word. More information at: <http://www.ourchildrenourfamilies.org/events/>
 - Stakeholder input meetings: Nov 12 and 16 from 3-5 pm in City Hall, Room 201 and Nov 19 from 9:30-11:30 at SFUSD Board Room. These are meetings for CBO leaders, advocates and other stakeholders to provide input on the development of the outcomes framework.
 - Our next working group meeting: Nov 24 at 4pm, City Hall in Room 201
 - Please complete Meeting Feedback Form and turn in to staff.
 - **Public Comment**
No public comment made.
 - **Adjournment**