



# 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 NOTES**

November 24, 2015

4:00 p.m.

Room 201, City Hall, 1 Dr. Carlton Goodlett Street, San Francisco, CA 94102

### Meeting Objectives:

- *Share highlights from community and stakeholder engagement*
- *Get temperature read from group on draft goals and measures of success*
- *Solicit feedback on draft conceptual approach to framework*

### **Call to Order and Roll Call**

Co-chair Dan Kelly opened up the meeting with introductions.

Dan then reviewed the meeting objectives and reviewed the agenda. Sandra Naughton of OCOF staff reviewed the goals of the working group, where the working group was in its timeline, and the guiding parameters established to guide the development of the framework.

### **Discussion of Highlights from Our Children, Our Families Council's Efforts to Gather Community and Stakeholder Input on the Development of the Outcomes Framework (discussion only)**

Sandra Naughton gave a highlight of the themes that have been coming up at the various community and stakeholder engagement meetings and referred to the summary document provided to members in advance of the meeting. She also gave an oral update on the 15 meetings with more than 170 parents that the SFUSD Parent Advisory Council has meet with on behalf of OCOF. A final report summarizing all of their meetings will be posted on the OCOF website by mid December.

There are several more community engagement meetings to be conducted, including 5 town hall meetings. Participants were asked to help promote the upcoming meetings. OCOF is also partnering with the Department of Children, Youth and Their Families on several smaller focus groups with targeted populations such as youth on probation and middle school youth exposed to violence.

A member brought up that in one of the stakeholder meetings, she heard a consistent concern that the outcomes framework does not have accountability measures for the city, district or Council. It was explained that accountability measures will be outlined in the five year plan, whereas the legislation specifically describes the outcomes framework as an articulation of milestones for children, youth and families. A member asked if demographic data had been collected for participants in the town hall meetings. Staff explained that only data about whether participants are parents, youth, service providers or community members is being collected, but that OCOF has been collected more specific demographic data for the smaller focus groups.

### **Group Discussions of Revised Draft Our Children, Our Families Council Outcomes Framework for Children, Youth & Families (discussion only)**

Sandra Naughton reviewed the revised version of the draft outcomes framework. Revisions were made based on the feedback from the various working group meetings, meetings with individual working group members, and community and stakeholder engagement meetings. Members were asked to use a “gradients of agreement” tool to individually rate their level of support for the goals and measures that they thought needed improvement. The scale they were asked to use was:

- 1) Fully support (I like it)
- 2) Endorsement with minor concerns (Basically, I like it)
- 3) Agree with reservations (I can live with it)
- 4) Don't endorse (I don't like it, but I don't want to hold up the group)
- 5) Block (I can't support the proposal)

Members were given time to write their ratings down on sticky notes that staff then collected. Staff would organize the large group discussion around the goals and measures with the most suggestions for improvement. Members were also asked to write down their suggestions for which contributing measures to eliminate or alter.

### ***Summary of group discussion***

Goal F- We ensure that SF remains vibrant due to its diverse families.

- SF child population is declining; concern about family flight, especially for particular demographics
- Only one measure for this goals; seems like a mismatch
- What indicates success? Are we benchmarking against previous years?
- So many factors contribute to the vitality of the city
- Language “vibrant” and “diverse” means different things to different people; more like an overarching vision statement than a goal
- Ideal to incorporate economic opportunity and willingness to stay
- If the goal is to sustain families, we need to be explicit
- Perhaps drop this as a goal; fear of losing credibility if listed as a goal; could address sentiment in framing narrative for whole framework

#7- % of children, youth, and transitional age youth who have not experienced trauma or toxic stress\*

- Toxic stress can be found/related to other measures (such as poverty, child maltreatment) so redundant
- What is the time period of the measure? Many people come to SF already with toxic stress s not sure of value of this measure
- How do we capture those who are under constant stress vs have experienced it in their lifetime? Seems like this measure would water down the severity of those experiencing acute stress
- ACE scores are not really designed for the population level
- Suggest dropping this as a measure

#8- % of children, youth, and transitional age youth who report having a caring adult in their lives

- If we use the new SFUSD Core survey we may get additional grade levels and a related family measure on family survey
- SFUSD would like to enhance CA Healthy Kids Survey to be a census of all kids – huge undertaking; would need funds
- TAY – maybe explore if enough CBOs have data on this measure to aggregate and inform?
- How will we capture adults beyond the school environment?

#11- % of youth ages 18-24 enrolled in school or work a living wage job

- Use self-sufficiency standard; makes consistent with other measure; could be vision for our city
- 18-24 year olds – unrealistic to have a living wage for this group; drop to just say employment
- Not just job – should be skilled job
- Employment is a proxy for other things/connectedness
- Perhaps try to also capture if in training or apprenticeship – on a pathway, tracking trajectory as a snapshot
- Acceptability vs accuracy
- Any job is better than no job

Proposed new measure – healthy births:

- Supported by science
- Measure of reproductive justice; captures health of families and women
- Prenatal care is a performance measure of the health care system; implications on how system thinks – why are certain groups not accessing prenatal care?
- Pre-term birth is the leading cause of mortality, low birthweight, opportunities later in life
- Great indicator of the population but not as closely tied to individual success
- Unintended pregnancy – leads to pre-term birth

- Post-partum depression – psycho-social measure
- How do we measure to drive ways for departments to collaborate?

Proposed new measure – % of children with library card:

- Library has data for youth and TAY; cards expire after 3 years on non-use so pretty fresh data
- Promotes interagency collaboration

Parking Lot Ideas:

- Impact of trauma and stress on families should be incorporated into the 5-year plan and action steps
- What other reports will explore issues of affordability/stability of housing?

### ***Individual Feedback***

The bullets below represent the rating from 1 to 5 in parentheses and comments from each working group member who submitted a comment about that goal or measure.

Goals overall

- We “ensure especially those most in need” – use different language – make available resources to children, youth and TAY, especially those in need to help them a, b, and c
- A-C – reorder so physical, emotional and mental health first (e.g. necessary for school success, etc.)

Goal A: We ensure that all children, youth and transitional age youth, especially those most in need, succeed in school

- (2) I have a question about measurement of early care enrollment for 0 year olds. I feel like there should be a measure of food security tied to school success
- (2) replace “succeed in school” with “thrive in a 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning environment”

Goal B: We ensure that all children, youth and transitional age youth, especially those most in need, succeed in post-secondary and/or career paths

- (2) “matriculate to and through an institution of higher learning and/or an economically viable career path”

Goal C: We ensure that all children, youth and transitional age youth, especially those most in need, are physically, emotionally and mentally healthy

- (2) “physically, emotionally, mentally, and culturally healthy and safe”

Goal D: We ensure that all families, especially those most in need, attain economic security and housing stability

- (2) “...for themselves and their children.”
- (2) “attain economic, food, and housing security”
- (1) pleased to see addition of stably housed

Goal E: We ensure that all families, especially those most in need, live in a safe and nurturing environment for their children

- (2) “...for themselves and their children.”

Goal F: We ensure that SF remains vibrant due to its diverse families

- (2) tighter language – vibrant and diverse can have many meanings
- (3) not sure what this means – how does city ensure diversity?
- Only one measure – seems sparse for a goal. Contributing measures – not clear if they are the best measures to the goal

#1: % of children (ages 0-5) enrolled in high-quality early care and education settings

- (2) Percent of what? Is it all children 0 to 5? Or percent of all income eligible children? Or % of children on the CEL?

#2: % of Kindergarteners ready for Kindergarten

- (2) SFUSD subset is not population level data; use Kindergarten Observation Form or population level alternate
- What data if any can be drawn upon to ensure that not only SFUSD pre-K students but pre-K students citywide are included in this measure?

#3: % K-12 students attending school regularly

- (2) attending school regularly does not necessarily mean child lives in a safe environment
- (3) are there other data sets for this measure in addition to SFUSD? Would also be good to know difference in sub population, ie LGBTQ youth, homeless youth, etc.; maybe look at data on homeless youth not enrolled in school

#4: % of students proficient or above in English Language Arts and Math in elementary and middle schools

- (2) question if we should link to C; proficiency in academics not mean there is an absence of physical, emotional or mental health issues
- May also want to include a measure reflecting the % of EL students who are reclassified as English proficient
- Clarify grade levels more specifically using common educational measures

#5: % Kindergarteners with dental cavities

- I am not sure why dental caries is elevated above other measures of health care access, e.g. health insurance, attends well-child checks, is vaccinated, etc.

#6: % of children and youth who have a healthy body composition

- Does it capture hunger in addition to obesity?

#7: % of children, youth, and transitional age youth who have not experienced trauma or toxic stress

- (4) don't endorse because of concerns about data reliability annually and effect of gentrification and forced emigration may be greater than the power of systems change to alter life experience
- (4) content already covered by other measures
- (4) all TAYS have experienced trauma
- Love spirit of this measure, but concern about reliability of measure from national survey's sample of SF. Also not strengths-based.
- Very unlikely that national survey will have sufficient sample size in SF

#8: % of children, youth, and transitional age youth who report having a caring adult in their lives

- (3) Measuring is problematic
- (1) data only collected for children and youth, not TAY

#9: % of 12th graders graduating high school

- (4) Once students are in the 12<sup>th</sup> grade, they are more likely to graduate. A more meaningful measure is % of 9<sup>th</sup> graders who graduate from high school

#11: % of youth ages 18-24 enrolled in school or work a living wage job

- (4) living wage is not feasible
- #11 and #13 – in interest of streamlining, wouldn't 13 cover the "living wage" part of #11?
- Don't measures #11 and #13 overlap? What if you meet one but not the other?
- Concerned about the definition of job. SF has a high level of educated and for SF residents to compete they will need to be educated or skilled.
- (2) use "wages at self-sufficiency standard" instead of "living wage" and use self-sufficiency standard as metric

#12: % of mothers receiving prenatal care in the first trimester

- Prenatal care could be a contributing factor. Other measures could be unintended pregnancy and or preterm births which are both precursors to goals A, C, D and E

#13: % of families with children and young adults who meet the Self-Sufficiency Standard (which is an alternative to the federal poverty level adjusted for local cost of living)

- (2) self sufficiency standard too high; would miss gentrification

#16: # of youth impacted by the juvenile justice system and/or have incarcerated parents

- Seems like two measures – youth and parents (may overlap)
- (3) not clear why these are combined; would want to understand more about why we think they should not stand separately

#17: % of families who report feeling safe in their neighborhoods

- (2) add percent of TAY who report that they feel safe
- (2) Could also extend survey to youth on how safe they feel in a neighborhood

#18: % change in demographics of families in SF (by race/ethnicity and socio-economic status)

- (4) what is the goal or idea here?
- (4) concern over how to decide the appropriate demographics
- How does his change indicate success? What is the baseline? What's the target?

The following new measures were suggested:

- Healthy births with pre-term births as the indicator. Measures reproductive justice and health condition of young women and mothers. It is not a contributing measure. Primary outcomes of this measure are infant deaths and drug-exposed habits.
- Postpartum depression
- Planned pregnancy
- Percent of children with library card
- % of children/adults connected to regular medical care

Contributing measures:

- B) family resource centers have data on this. May be more reliable than CHIS sample
- C) wouldn't SFUSD know this? Consider omitting
- G) redundant to #11 and #13; not sure measurable; not sure this will show anything substantially important; too variable
- F) redundant with #10
- K) not sure what this shows;
- M) add "or in education;" participation in a service is not an outcome measure. % of unemployed parents is a measure.
- N) % of families spending less than 50% on housing
- O) too subjective – how will we define stable in foreseeable future? Maybe explore evictions; # of affordable units for families being added; OCOF to explore proxies with MOHCD
- Q) does not seem meaningful or measureable;
- R) unclear on meaning
- NEW: Consider one on referrals to special education, especially for African American children or percent of African American children in special education
- NEW: broader question about youth development/enrichment activities for becoming contributing adult instead of contributing measure focused on afterschool in CHKS

### **Discussion of Proposed Conceptual Approach to Outcomes Framework for Children, Youth & Families (discussion only)**

Sandra Naughton gave an overview of the various versions of the conceptual approaches to the framework that have been introduced to the group. The original version was

linear, the second version was non linear and depicted the goals as inter-related. The latest iteration attempts to incorporate portions of both of the previous approaches.

A member indicated he appreciated the effort that was put into it. The “concentric circles” graphic is clear. One member indicated an appreciation for going back to a linear format. Members appreciated having the complete framework and contextual components on one page. Staff noted that a graphic designer would be used to flesh out the final version.

### **Announcements**

Sandra Naughton outlined the next steps for the development of the framework: OCOF staff will send out notes. A draft of the next version of the framework will be posted in mid December on the OCOF website and circulated to Council members. An online survey will also be posted online so that anyone can submit feedback. The next council meeting is on Jan 28 where the council will consider acting on the outcomes framework. The next working group will take place on Feb 12.

### **Public Comment**

No public comment was made.

### **Adjournment**